

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE summer number of *The Hibbert Journal* is rich in interesting articles even beyond the ordinary. Almost all of them lend themselves to description, but pride of place must be given to the first which has for its title 'Man, the Adolescent' and for its author the Bishop of Birmingham. Dr. BARNES appears so little in print that we are more than ready to listen to anything he says, especially when, as in this instance, his subject is so 'topical.'

The war just ended has, he says, left men perplexed and anxious. Few now think that we are moving to some Utopia soon to be reached. The more common belief is that the leading races of mankind are preparing for mutual destruction. A philosophy of pessimism has consequently emerged. It takes two forms. Some have abandoned all belief in a beneficent Providence. Others claim that God is good but remote. Man is a 'fallen' creature who, by reason of his 'fallen' nature, turns every great discovery to evil ends. So humanism is the enemy to be feared and shunned.

Dr. BARNES sees no reason to choose either of these alternatives. In the first place, it seems to him certain that a guiding Power controls our destinies. Recent physical research has emphasized that the material world in its infinitesimal foundations is elaborately organized; it seems to have been planned by a Mind to which our minds are akin. With that Mind we must associate power and order. Thus, to deny the existence of a Creator is 'to me impossible,' he says.

Secondly, while Dr. BARNES respects the honest repudiation of the Christian idea of God by those who, like Housman, find in the world 'much good, but much less good than ill,' he has no sympathy with those who, professing to be Christians, speak of God as remote from the world which He has made, and describe man as a fallen creature.

Such teaching is non-Christian. Man, according to Christ, is a potential son of God, to whom he should turn as to a Father. Man, in fact, is not a fallen creature. He is rising, slowly and with many set-backs; and a great future stretches before him.

At present this Christian optimism is widely repudiated. Naturally so. When things go awry on a large scale we instinctively embrace some form of pessimism, unless we take long views. We tend to measure the future by taking as a standard the length of human life. But in this way we form a distorted picture and judge ultimate Reality by our personal fortunes. We ought rather to view our calamities on the background of an evolution that has lasted many millions of years. We cannot separate the emergence of life and of living forms from their evolution; and it is difficult to regard their existence and development as an accident when they partake of such persistence.

Dr. BARNES gives a vivid imaginative picture of the course of evolution which has ended, at least for the time, in the emergence of man. The pessimist will contend that evolution has not much to boast of in this climax. We, the heirs of all the ages, are profoundly disappointing. And there is much in current events to encourage his pessimism. But it is to be remembered that man is no finished product. He is but slowly growing to his full stature. He has had a past of, let us say, a million years. But, so far as we can tell, this earth will support for hundreds of millions of years life as it exists in ourselves. Man may have ten millions of years still before him. And he is still only in the adolescent stage.

Man at his present stage has all the faults and failings of an adolescent. He may show himself brutal and savage. But on the other hand in other conditions he will scorn comfort and seek

brave adventure, physical and mental. His development is slow. Man 'climbs up his ancestral tree,' but the process is painfully deliberate. If we put the starting-point of civilization at twenty thousand years ago we can perceive the gradualness of the evolution. We cannot be, in our essential make-up, very different from our ancestors at any time within the neolithic era.

During this time the emotional growth of the adolescent has been tardy. Just as, during the last six thousand years, epochs of fine achievement have been followed by periods of disorder or anarchy, just as war has destroyed what peace has brought to birth, so we must recognize that similar tendencies are still strong. Our knowledge of their strength should be a warning rather than a reason for pessimism. Man is still evolving. He is, though with incredible dilatoriness, becoming more wise and sensible; and, because we now know more of his past and of past causes of failure, we can, with our greater knowledge seek to guard against the recurrence of a new era of barbarism.

Such an era may come, but Dr. BARNES is confident that there will come also a new attempt to fashion world-order as the Christian believes that God would desire it to be. Yet, obviously, if this happy event is to materialize we shall need the sort of spiritual awakening which the greatest religious leaders of mankind have preached. In a striking paragraph the Bishop summarizes the teaching of Confucius, Buddha, and Jesus, contending that they are singularly close to one another in their practical advice. The likeness is as noteworthy as the way in which the teaching of these spiritual leaders of the past is ignored by their nominal followers. That teaching, in fact, imposes too great a strain on adolescent man. Even those who, as priests and ministers, confidently extol the wisdom of the great men whom they profess to follow, in practice ignore it.

Yet Dr. BARNES thinks that increasingly, after each successive war that disgraces the earth, a sense of shame comes upon the combatants, victors and vanquished alike. The finer types of men are uneasy. They have an instinctive aversion to the baser animal instincts which we have inherited. It may be said of us to-day that when we have defeated our enemies we do not enslave them; we feed them. And we may also confidently affirm that even the ideals to which we are unfaithful still show the advance we have made, for while we ignore them in practice we cherish a reverence for them in our hearts.

So, if there be for humanity no immediate expectation of the Kingdom of God, we need not despair of its coming. Hope, real though remote, remains. The message of the Bishop's article is that man, though an adolescent and because he is an adolescent, has a great future. But to many this will seem little comfort. What matters the state of civilization a million years hence when human life ends within some four-score years? Has the individual man any greater significance than the lower forms of life from which he has emerged? To that question, of vast importance, the natural sciences supply no answer. But the Bishop finds an answer in the advance man has made from his remote ancestors. By reason of this we have entered into a new quality of being, carrying with it potential immortality. In other words, that which is good is born for eternity. This is the Christian interpretation of the evolutionary process.

The Rev. R. P. McDERMOTT, Sub-Warden of St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, has done a good service not only to Anglicans but to British churchmen generally in the ninth of the New Series of 'Theology' Occasional Papers—*The Anglican Interpretation of the Fourth Commandment*.¹ All over the English-speaking world the old Sabbatarianism is dead or dying. Yet it stood for something that to the Christian mind is worth conserving. And in this Paper we have a timely reminder of what the relationship of the Anglican Church is to the institution of the Jewish Sabbath. Members of other churches also might well take note.

What is Sabbatarianism? It is the belief that 'in virtue of a Divine ordinance declared in the Fourth Commandment, and for ever binding all men as a Moral Law, all but the most necessary forms of labour and all or nearly all forms of amusement are prohibited on the Lord's Day.' Thus Sabbatarianism denotes a belief held by certain Christians; it gathers round the Lord's Day, not round the Jewish Sabbath.

If Sabbatarianism is defensible it is only, says the writer of the Paper, in its full coherence as it was stated by the Puritan theology of the past, and nowhere better than in the Westminster Confession of Faith. A particular merit of this Confessional statement is the place and importance it gives to a principle of the Natural Law according to which some portion of our time is due to the worship of God.

¹ S.P.C.K.; 6d.

Here is the statement (ch. xxi. §§ 7, 8): '7. As it is of the law of nature, that in general a due proportion of our time be set apart for the worship of God; so, in his word, by a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment, binding all men in all ages, he hath particularly appointed one day in seven for a sabbath, to be kept holy unto him: which from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ was the last day of the week; and from the resurrection of Christ was changed into the first day of the week, which in Scripture is called the Lord's Day, and is to be continued to the end of the world as the Christian Sabbath.'

'8. This Sabbath is kept holy unto the Lord, when men after a due preparing of their hearts, and ordering of their common affairs beforehand, do not only observe a holy rest from their own works, words, and thoughts about their worldly employments and recreations but also are taken up the whole time in the publick and private exercises of his worship, and in the duties of necessity and mercy.'

It is to be observed that in the Westminster Confession the Sabbath is affirmed to be a 'positive' law, and not a declaration of the Natural Law like the rest of the Decalogue; but unlike other positive laws it is 'moral and perpetual,' and not ceremonial and so of no obligation under the Christian dispensation. It is a special ordinance imposed on all men everywhere for ever. It could not be a precept of the Natural Law that some specified portion of our time, here one day in seven, is owed to worship. Says the Westminster Confession, the specified time of one day in seven is a positive obligation imposed by God on the human race.

This is the theory under which the Sabbath was transferred from the seventh to the first day of the week, and this Sabbatarian theory of Sunday became powerful in Great Britain 'despite the overthrow of Puritanism by the triumphant Anglicanism of the Restoration.' Indeed behind much of the discussion of Sunday in our own time there still lies the opinion that the Lord's Day is of immediate and direct obligation in virtue of the positive enactment found in the Decalogue.

The author of the Paper points out that this Puritan interpretation, which first began in the

reign of Elizabeth in England, and seems to have spread for a while to the Continent, was summarily rejected by Calvin (as it had been by St. Thomas Aquinas); but what he is chiefly concerned to point out is that while there are distinct differences among leading Anglican divines as to the measure of authority to be attributed to the Fourth Commandment they are generally at one in repudiating Sabbatarianism.

The Thirty-Nine Articles, the Prayer Book, and the Homilies give no support to the new Sabbatarian doctrine, but the spread of Sabbatarianism led to many discussions of it in the seventeenth century. In that century many of the classical Anglican divines repudiated 'the perpetual morality of the Sabbath.' Thorndike and Bramhall are here cited, and Jeremy Taylor, and the Calvinists Rogers and Prideaux. 'All alike reject Sabbatarianism, all maintain that Sunday does not rest directly on the Fourth Commandment, all hold that the mode of its observance is to be determined by ecclesiastical law and custom.'

Hooker, whose views on this subject must be collected from various passages of his writings, appears to differ from the divines already cited in holding that the Fourth Commandment is of perpetual obligation as a positive Moral Law. But it is said that while this comes very near to Sabbatarianism the tone of his discussion is not Sabbatarian, and he does not countenance any prohibition of such recreations as do not interfere with the duty of worship.

The evidence presented in the Paper is summed up in this way. The formularies to which the Anglican Church demands subscription do not impose the doctrine that the observance of Sunday rests directly on the Fourth Commandment. The leading Anglican theologians bear various testimonies. Some hold that Sunday is purely of ecclesiastical observance, others that it is either an immutable Apostolic tradition or a Divine positive law of the New Testament of perpetual obligation, and others (Hooker's view apparently) that by the observance of Sunday a Divine positive and immutable law requiring that one day in each week should be sanctified by religious worship is fulfilled.

Towards the Conversion of England.

Evangelism and the Young.

BY THE REVEREND BRYAN S. W. GREEN, B.D., LONDON.

THE truth is, I believe, that very little effective evangelism is being done to-day amongst the young. This truth is unpalatable and will be hotly contested by the host of Club Leaders, Guiders, Bible Class Leaders, Revivalists, and all the others who are Christians, and who work amongst youth in one sphere or another. But where is the evidence of this effective evangelism? And where is the evidence of vigorous and progressive leadership directed to the supreme object of winning young people to Christ? The bankruptcy of the programme of the Youth Committee of the British Council of Churches is plain. Lengthy conferences and wordy platitudes, then more conferences and more platitudes are offered to youth leaders; but never a clear grasp and plain statement that modern youth is heathen and needs deep, radical conversion to Christ by the power of the Spirit. We can welcome the emphasis on the spiritual given in a recent manifesto of the National Association of Boys' Clubs, but we hope—and not very hopefully—that this pious aspiration will lead to definitely Christian evangelism. Action is what we need—action that springs from repentance, because for a period of years we have sought to inspire youth instead of converting them, to influence them instead of 'capturing them alive' as Christ laid down for His disciples.

The evidence for our failure to evangelize lies ready to hand. In every denomination Sunday School scholars—a diminishing number—fail to continue on into the Bible Class or 14+ Church organization. Only a small percentage of the confirmation candidates in the Church of England each year become regular communicants and continue observably as practising Christians. From our Public Schools each year a number of regular Chapel-goers are turned out—but how many display a vital Christianity afterwards? Youth clubs, run either by the Churches or by leaders who are Christians, have a large membership—but there is little or no sign that they are 'being added to the Church'—not even to the visible organization, and certainly not to the true Body of Christ. Where is the vigorous Christian Youth Action Party comparable to the Young Communists or to the Hitler Youth Movement?

Now, of course, the above generalizations are only as valid as generalizations ever are. All of us know of exceptions to what I have written and

have seen genuine and solid success in winning young people to our Lord. But few observers will, I think, deny the main accuracy of my contention, though I hope that this article may lead to some controversy and discussion of this obstinate and supremely important problem. At the time of writing it seems possible that a Commission may be set up within the Church of England to investigate in detail this sphere of evangelism, as the Committee which issued *Towards the Conversion of England* did in the general field. Nothing could be more timely.

This failure to evangelize young people is only part of the failure to evangelize people in general. The Church in Britain is now a Missionary Church—but there are still far too many parsons and older Church members who refuse to face this fact in its stark nakedness. But when we as Christians do see the situation as it is, then evangelism becomes the pressing, urgent, predominant task.

It should not be necessary to define evangelism, but it is. Strictly speaking, to evangelize is to proclaim the gospel or to 'offer Christ.' But we usually mean something more than this. It is to offer Christ and to persuade men to give an answer—in which 'crisis' the many will say 'no' and some will say 'yes' and be obviously added to the number of disciples. This 'crisis' is a crisis of choice and need not be an emotional experience or a dramatic conversion. But evangelism is not just offering the gospel in a 'take it or leave it' fashion, but a 'persuading' men and demanding a verdict. True evangelism is therefore definite and precise in its objective—to win men to accept Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord. We are not content to 'influence a number of fish' but to land them. Character training, and forming a basis for decent living are important; but to the evangelistically-minded Christian (the adjective should be unnecessary, Christian should suffice) conversion to Christ is basic and something different. It is spiritual life from above, a God-given change in a man's personality, which will result in a life which shows the marks of the Biblical Christian life in a twentieth-century dress.

Before this evangelism can take place to-day there usually has to be a great deal of pre-evangelism, the sowing of the seed of the gospel.

To the materialist and secular-minded, much truth has to be presented before they are ready for the gospel. And after evangelism there must follow pastoral care, otherwise the newly awakened soul will be overwhelmed by the pressure of the 'world,' and will not progress into the full Christian experience. But in between pre-evangelism and pastoral care stands evangelism. And it is this kind of evangelism which seems to be lacking or which, when it is tried, often seems to be ineffective. When we sow, we expect to reap, and then to use the fruits. It is mere escapism to say that we must just go on sowing the gospel seeds in pre-evangelism, and not worry about the harvest. This is not the New Testament spirit, and cannot be accepted as God's will for our generation.

It has often been pointed out that never before have there been so many influences so powerfully at work to condition people—especially the young—in an atheistic (in practice, but not necessarily in theory) and secular direction. Press, Radio, and Cinema exert a constant pressure of suggestion that 'things' alone matter. Science and Psychology give point to the idea that we have the technique for living without God. Utopia is materialistic in both form and content. To thousands of the young our idea of God is 'bunk' and our need of Him an ecclesiastical invention. Religion 'rings no bell.' To use one of their current phrases—'they couldn't care less.' This, I believe, is true in spite of the transient interest that sometimes can be aroused in a religious discussion.

This then is the problem set for the Christian Church as she surveys the youth of Britain, 80 per cent. of whom have left school at fourteen for the factory, office, or odd job. The other 20 per cent. have had secondary education or technical training. For them our approach and methods may have to be different—but basically the problem is the same. As Christians we must contact them, challenge them, and convert them to Christ.

Perhaps at this point I should make it clear that I do not write as an expert. I have tried to win young people for Christ—with some success but not with much. Others have been more successful. But I am deeply concerned about this matter. As an observer and a traveller I question whether many Christians are very successful, and even sometimes whether they are trying. My hope is that this article will provoke criticism and controversy, leading perhaps to some of us learning better ways and seeing more clearly what we should do.

Consider the question of making contact. It is true, I think, that during the last twenty years

there has been throughout Britain a slight increase in the number of young people attending church. But even this is probably less than one in ten. Scouts, Guides, Youth Clubs, and other such organizations provide a greater opportunity for contact and the numbers thus touched are considerable. It is often a perfectly good contact for Christianity even if the particular organization is not under the auspices of a church, because in so many cases the leaders are Christians and themselves members of the Church. But beyond any organization there must be a continuous contact between the Christian and non-Christian in the ordinary activities of daily living. In the school and in the factory, in sports club and in home life, at work and on holiday, Christians of all ages are making contact with non-Christian youth. The opportunity is there to be seized.

But the adolescent is shy and self-conscious. His self-assurance covers a very real sense of perplexity and often of frustration. While he has little use for the word 'sin,' he knows the experience of failure and the shame it brings. To-day, unfortunately, he has few loyalties—surprisingly few, sometimes not even to the club to which he may belong. His most powerful loyalty is to a person, chiefly to his pals. He is suspicious of organized religion and hates to be 'got at.'

The first contact of the Christian with young people must be by way of friendship. This is indispensable. They must feel that we are really interested in them and are truly their friends. We cannot rush this; it will take time and it must be sincere on our part, with no ulterior motives. Such friendship, if it is to issue in winning young people for Christ, is costly and demands the complete giving of oneself. It takes time and trouble. It is precisely because they have this attitude of friendship that we see some quite unlikely persons amazingly successful in evangelizing youth. Their technique is faulty; their methods unorthodox; their theological views peculiar; and to us, perhaps, their personalities unattractive. But so utterly do they devote their time and energy to their young friends, that they are given in return confidence and loyalty, leading to opportunities of winning some to Jesus Christ.

One of the pressing questions of youth leadership to-day is a sufficient supply of such men and women who will take up the work with a definite sense of vocation. For economic reasons many now need to receive a salary—and all should be prepared to be trained. Yet herein lies a danger that training and a career may be substitutes for vocation. Moreover, the voluntary worker is hampered by the necessary 'cares of the world.' It is the single-mindedness which 'celibacy' may give the

Roman priest that is so difficult for the youth leader to have who can only give his spare time, and who also may be married.

Apart from Club leadership and similar activities, there is a need for missionary-minded Christians as personnel managers in factories, welfare workers, probation officers, and, of course, teachers. This call should be pressed home upon Christian young people in all the Churches. The task of the parson should be constantly to keep this problem before his people, and to create an awakened and concerned Christian public who will have the young on their consciences and in their minds. This will prepare some to hear the Holy Spirit's call and to be equipped as specialists, and all to be ready to seize opportunities of friendship.

Granted this basic contact through friendship, what are the further practical steps of organization that can be taken to evangelize youth? Roughly we can divide the approach under three heads—the club or youth organization, the direct evangelistic approach, and thirdly, various more personal methods. The club or some other organized group, such as Scouts, is perhaps the commonest method by which the Christian Church establishes contact with the non-Christian young people. There is a good deal of discussion on the relative merits of the 'open club' and the 'closed club,' where membership is only for those who belong to the church or come to the Bible Class. Superficially there is much to be said for the latter from the evangelistic standpoint, for the young people are thus brought into contact with the gospel in church or at class. Recently I was preaching at an evening service where there were two or three hundred adolescents—clearly not converted!—who came each Sunday because they enjoyed the week-day clubs. It seemed a great opportunity. On closer examination the opportunity is not as good as it appears. It is doubtful whether they are ready for preaching; and it seems evident from experience that a 'closed club' so often does not attract to its membership the young people who most need help. This is unfortunately true of all organized youth movements, as stated in their official reports. The real 'toughs' often cannot be drawn into them. This is all the more likely to happen with a 'closed club.' There are, of course, notable exceptions where you have the consecrated single-minded leader of imagination who can do almost anything with anybody anywhere.

Without elaborating the technique of running an 'open club,' there are certain observations which may be of value. No evangelism will happen unless the leader, the helpers, and some of the members are definite Christians with a missionary purpose. Our Lord's own inner band

gives New Testament support for this contention. Yet it is precisely this which is lacking in clubs, sponsored by Christians. Friendship and personal contact are foundational. It is tiring and exacting—but abundantly repays. What else can we do? Club prayers are of doubtful value for evangelism. Similarly a club service on Sundays followed by general activities and canteen result so often in the majority putting up with the service for the programme afterwards. Pre-evangelism by means of discussions, etc., on a wide range of subjects, seems to be the best way of interesting and awakening a number who can then be evangelized through a club service or some other direct method. But here again the personal work with individuals is the only sure way of approach. Summer camps are invaluable at this point, as in the community living the Christian emphasis can make its impact and there is time for the unhurried personal contacts. In some 'open clubs' this is the evangelistic opportunity of the year.

The approach of direct evangelism is very different. The start is a religious meeting—plainly and publicly so. There are many varieties, such as the Crusaders, the Schools Conferences of the S.C.M., the Holiday Campaigns, Saturday Night Youth Rallies, Fellowships, King's Own Meetings, Squashes, Restaurant and Café Meetings, Epilogues, and so on. They all have this in common. Directly and forthrightly the gospel of Christ is presented to such young people as can be induced to attend. Clearly it is rather a hit or miss method. But most certainly in the hands of competent leadership there are the observable results of conversion to our Lord, and with adequate pastoral care of adding members to the Church of Christ. A detailed discussion of the technique of such approaches is outside the scope of this article. But trained leadership and attractive programmes are a *sine qua non*, together with that basic factor—Christians, who are missionary in outlook and who will make the personal contacts of friendship with individuals. I am inclined to think that development along lines like these may be very valuable in the future. But it will be necessary to examine the techniques and the programmes to ensure that the message of the gospel does not lose its edge through obscurantist ideas, or through old-fashioned or new-fangled emphases and shibboleths.

Thirdly, the personal approach—this has endless varieties. It is unobtrusive, continuous, and effective. But it demands a much more awakened and trained body of Christians than is at present to be found within the Christian Churches. Obvious instances occur to one's mind; the attempt made, I think, by the Church of Scotland to contact young people within the Youth Hostels

by Christian youth, also enjoying a hiking week-end, is an instance of planned personal approach; the Christian personnel manager who uses his opportunities to help in human problems to lead to the real need for Christ; the casual conversations and contacts of daily office or sports club life. But this must be made plain to the average churchgoer, who never bothers about using them. Perhaps one method may be singled out—a simple one but for food rationing! The use of the Christian home. So many young people are not really happy at home, and they leap at the chance to go with a few pals into somebody's house. All they want is to be there—play the gramophone, have a game of table tennis, talk and, if possible, some 'eats.' We all know Christian homes like this where the young people come and go freely. The atmosphere and friendship is pre-evangelism; and from time to time when confidence is gained, there is a chance for the direct approach, generally to the individual. This open-home approach must be genuinely friendly and religion in no way obtruded. I am convinced that here is a call to Christians who have, so they say, few gifts—but do want to love their neighbours and thus to follow Christ. After all, the Church has paid agents in every town and village, together with a large body of potential canvassers and salesmen. But they are not 'putting it over.'

This article perforce must limit itself to a few generalizations on an immense subject. I have deliberately excluded evangelistic work amongst the under fourteen age group with all the thought-provoking questions that it raises. For instance, are our Sunday Schools any real use whatever in the majority of cases for winning children to our

Lord? Are the lessons written from this point of view and with this ultimate objective? I have not touched the thorny question of the Public Schools and their responsibility to seize the opportunity of the community life really to win the young to faith in Christ. There is ground here that needs investigating with scientific integrity and then the results stated with brutal frankness. Till the Church repents her failures, advance is impossible. Radical change is demanded—patching-up won't do.

Finally perhaps we can sum up the burden of this article in some such fashion as this. Young people are frustrated and leaderless. They are looking for something; they don't know what; as far as they are concerned it isn't God. We believe Christ is the one they need. We must 'offer Him' to them somehow by every means. They look for forthrightness and plainness of speech without ecclesiasticisms. They want reasonable and authoritative answers to their questions. I doubt if most of them want a hero—as youth guide books say. I am sure they want a saviour to save them from the frustration and failure they feel—often unconsciously. And then they look for a leader whom they can follow with a total devotion. Here we older compromising Christians fail them. We are afraid of fanaticism; we are not ourselves willing to give Christ everything. So to the total war that Evil wages we offer in contrast a half-hearted following of Christ. Youth, I believe, will give totally when it gives at all. Christ makes that total claim. Let them see the issue—the battle is plainly joined—and we can summon them to surrender to Christ whose service is perfect freedom.

Remembrance Day.

Arguments for Unity.

BY THE REVEREND RODERICK BETHUNE, M.A., ABERDEEN.

'Ye are come . . . to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.'—He 12^{22, 24}.

IMAGINE a man writing to a community which was growing depressed by the difficulties by which it was beset, which was becoming increasingly impatient under persecution, and which was seriously divided, and you have a fairly accurate conception of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of the task he set himself when he composed this part of his letter.

Aware that the depression and the impatience and the disunity of his fellow-Christians did not augur well for the success of their common cause, he endeavoured to replace them with courage, patience, and unity. He counselled them, depressed by the difficulties by which they were beset, to recollect how Jesus, beset by difficulties just as great as theirs, allowed nothing to deflect Him

from the goal He was minded to reach and ran His race steadily and courageously to the very end. He counselled them, impatient under persecution, to recollect that, while no trial was pleasant, loyalty under trials of various kinds had proved beneficial to many causes and must, in the long run, prove beneficial to their cause.

Having dealt with their depression and their impatience, he went on to deal with their most serious defect—their disunity. How could men and women who were not themselves united hope to unite other men and women? How could a cause whose protagonists were not in sympathy with one another ever flourish? If their disunity were allowed to continue the complete failure of their cause was only a question of time. But how was he to persuade men and women who were disunited that they must unite? He must adduce arguments whose cogency they would be compelled to admit and in face of whose inexorable logic they would be compelled to review their relationships.

The arguments he decided to adduce are suggested by the words of the text: 'Ye are come . . . to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.' First, that is to say, he chose to remind them that their lack of sympathy with one another was on all fours with Cain's attitude to Abel whom he finally killed. God had so ordered life that Cain and Abel should be mutually dependent, that the hunter should rely upon the agriculturist and the agriculturist upon the hunter. Cain, by killing his brother, had not only done violence to the principle upon which life was based but had rendered his own life insecure. Those to whom he wrote, said this author, were guilty of similar transgressions. Their disunity did violence to the principle of mutual dependence upon which life was based and rendered their own individual lives insecure. No man among them had been given all the gifts necessary for a successful life: some had been given to their neighbours. They were therefore dependent upon each other, as surely as Cain and Abel were dependent upon each other, as surely as the hunter was dependent upon the agriculturist and the agriculturist upon the hunter. If they would survive, then, they must come together. Unity would mean life. Disunity would mean death. God had decreed it so in the home and in the community and in the Church. The second argument he chose to adduce was, to his mind, more powerful than the first, particularly where men and women professing loyalty to Jesus were concerned. If the blood of Abel and their lack of sympathy with one another alike did violence to the principle upon which life was based, their lack of sympathy and the disunity resulting from it did violence to the blood of Jesus Christ. What had

Jesus come into the world to do? He had come to unite men first to Himself and then to one another. The mark of His follower was that, having been generously dealt with, he dealt generously with others, having himself been forgiven he was willing to forgive, having himself been regarded with consideration by Jesus he tried to see everyone through Jesus' eyes. Doubtless there were some among them whom it was difficult to deal with generously, whom it was hard to forgive and very hard to see through the eyes of Jesus. But, because of their professed attachment to Jesus, they should have discovered a power which enabled them to adjust themselves to such people successfully. Never to try to adjust themselves to such people was to crucify Jesus afresh.

The cogency of such arguments his correspondents must have been driven to admit, and in face of their inexorable logic they must have been constrained to review their relationships. How could men fail to review their relationships to whom it had been made clear, first, that if they didn't unite there could be no survival for any of them, and secondly, that if they didn't unite they denied completion to the work Jesus came into the world to do?

To-day we are thinking not of a small community which is disunited, nor of a Church that is disunited, but of a world that is disunited. Peace, for which we all longed so eagerly for six hard years, has come at last. But some are wondering whether it has come to stay. So often in the past has peace proved to be the period of preparation for the next war that thinking men are persuaded that opportunity must be taken to impress upon the whole world that the preservation of peace is every nation's and every individual's concern. But how are we to impress that upon the world and upon individuals? To some of us it seems that the two arguments which were used so long ago are the arguments we must use to-day—first, that if men don't unite there can be no survival for anyone, and, secondly, that disunity is a crucifying of Jesus Christ afresh.

1. The first argument is being pressed by men outwith as well as by men within the Church, by men who have no particular attachment to any denomination and who have never subscribed to any Christian creed.

Some of them don't begin, of course, from the story of Cain and Abel, but they do begin from the principle that life is based upon mutual dependence and from the assertion that any violation of that principle can have but one end and that a destructive end. They maintain that, clear as such things must have been to our forbears, they must be clearer far to us. And perhaps they are right. The war years taught us, for example, how dependent

we are even for food supplies upon other parts of the world. Further, there is not one of us but realises, as he recollects the lives laid down during the recent conflict, that the future will be the poorer without them, without their gifts and without their leadership. Again, all of us, as we ponder the greatest discovery made during the struggle, are aware that a potent weapon, whose destructive power is swift and complete, has been placed in men's hands. Everything, that is to say, the food we eat, the sacrifices that have been made for us, the potential power for destruction that is now in men's hands, persuades us that we must come together, that life can only be made to work properly when we do get together, and that unless we get together there cannot be any survival for any of us. Let us bring such facts home to our contemporaries, say the sponsors of this argument, let us face them with the inexorable logic of contemporary events, and men and women everywhere must be compelled to review their relationships.

Ernest Raymond, the writer, and his son, Patrick Raymond, are among those who have expressed such an opinion. In their book, *Back to Humanity*, they maintain that, in spite of all the wars in which they have engaged, men are essentially and innately humane, and, in spite of all the incredible follies they have committed, they have more than a modicum of common sense to which we may confidently appeal. In support of their contention they remind us that 'in the hundred years between 1814 and 1914 the common sense of the people forced into existence thirty-three international organizations which should override the self-centredness of individual states. The best known is the Universal Postal Union. "Summer time" is another instance of sense triumphing over individualism. The thirteen states of America are another.'

One hopes that such men's optimism will be justified and that their belief that if men have the facts before them they will respond aright will prove well founded. At any rate, one wishes them well, for one knows that the position as they outline it is the position as it really is. We must either come together or perish. That is the principle upon which life is based and from that principle there is no escape.

2. But is this argument enough? May we in our day stop short where the writer, who sought the unity of a largely forgotten little Christian community, found it necessary to proceed? Are we so far advanced, so innately humane and so full of common sense, that we don't need his second argument, can, in fact, leave God out of this whole business?

One's mind goes back to an evening in the autumn of 1938 when Mr. Neville Chamberlain, then Prime

Minister, broadcast a speech in which he confessed that his hopes of maintaining the peace of the world were gradually receding. It seems absurd, he said in effect, that at this time of day, at our stage of civilization, we should at this moment be digging trenches and erecting air-raid shelters. Absurd it may have been, absurd it assuredly was, yet that was the activity in which innately humane and full of common sense men were engaged to protect themselves against other men who are, according to Mr. Ernest Raymond, as innately humane and as full of common sense as any. Apparently, in the past at least, a point has come in the experience of men when their innate humaneness and their common sense have failed to prevent them disrupting the unity of mankind, though the cost of any such disruption even to themselves must have been very clear. It may be, of course, that their increased experience and their clearer knowledge of what any disruption of our human unity must mean to themselves as well as to others may deter them in a way in which they have never allowed themselves to be deterred in the past. But some of us feel that that is not a certainty and that some further argument must be used if the peace of the world is to be maintained.

Another argument lies ready to our hand. It is the argument which this writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews used long ago—that disunity is not only a violation of the principle upon which life is based but an affront to the living God who made clear His purposes for men in Jesus Christ and whose purposes, though they may be temporarily thwarted, must ultimately prevail. It is when men leave Him out of account, as the Nazi leaders of Germany clearly evidenced, that men find it impossible to restrain their selfishness, that their baser selves overcome their innate humaneness and their common sense, and that they engage in all kinds of inhuman acts. That being so, it is clear to many of us, that only when men restore Him to His rightful place in their affections, only when they realize that the blood of Christ speaketh better things than that of Abel, become aware that they must come together, not simply in order to survive, but because God made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on the face of the earth, can we look forward hopefully to the future.

There may be some who, as soon as they hear such a suggestion, are filled with doubts and perplexities. Isn't a large part of the world un-Christian and are not many men unbelievers? they ask. If that is so, to what purpose shall we speak about God and about God's desire for the world? A large part of the world may be un-Christian and many men in many parts may be unbelievers, but you and I, as part of the Christian Church, must work and pray for the enlightenment of un-Christian

lands and for the conversion of all unbelievers. Part of the purpose of Remembrance Day surely is that we should dedicate ourselves afresh to that task. As the death of Abel constrained men to think of a principle that had been violated, so, it is hoped, will the recollection of the sacrifices made by men and women on land and on sea and in the air constrain us to think of the purposes of God to which men have wittingly and wantonly denied fulfilment, and of the blood of Christ which was shed that all men might be united to Him and then to one another. Realizing that only as men are brought to Jesus Christ and see one another through His eyes can there be any hope of unity and goodwill, we are expected to dedicate ourselves

to bringing men into living touch with Him whose fellowship is life.

The men and women who will not come back should be constraining us so to dedicate ourselves. The rising generations should be constraining us so to dedicate ourselves. God in Jesus Christ should be constraining us so to dedicate ourselves. The future of the world depends upon our so dedicating ourselves. Let us tell men, as many outwith the Church are telling them, that they must come together or perish. But let us tell them something more—that God made of one blood all nations to dwell on the face of the earth and that, as they are wise, they will seek the fulfilment of His, and not of their own, purposes.

Literature.

CHRISTIAN WORLD MISSION.

THE Commission on Ministerial Training of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States, Nashville, Tennessee, has produced an impressive volume bearing the title *Christian World Mission* (\$2.00). Its aim is, apparently, to issue a call to the whole Church throughout the world 'to join hands in common cause for a new world.' The volume, while largely Methodist in its authorship, is a composite production. 'Its thirty authors represent nine nationalities and eleven different branches of the Christian Church.' Among its authors are nationals of China, Japan, and India, while a Metropolitan of the Russian Orthodox Church writes of religion in Russia and Professor Tillich writes of the German Church. The book gives valuable information on many aspects of the World Church as it faces the present world situation. If it is read and assimilated it should help towards its bold objective. That is stated by the editor in these words: 'Fragmentary attempts at redemption are too little. A global effort must ensue. Provincialism and Nationalism are anachronisms.'

There is much here to which attention might be drawn, such as, for example, a contribution by Toyohiko Kagawa. His subject is 'Christianity in Japan,' and he gives some information as to his own war experience, 'the agony of his heart.' 'At the outbreak of the war I had felt that if I could only go out into the Pacific and die on the Cross as Jesus died, it might be that I could bring about reconciliation between the two countries without war.' Again he says, 'I have gone to China to express my repentance to her people and I wish I could express my repentance to the American people too.' He also pays a tribute to General MacArthur's 'noble ideas.' Hope has not died in him as he from the midst of his desolate land faces the future.

Japan has its tragic place in the world of to-day

and Kagawa will play his part, one trusts, with the courage he has always shown. And so also will the Christians of China and of India. Dr. Francis Wei's article on China's attitude to Christianity is critical of how that religion has been presented to his people through their contacts with the West. It is significant that two things that he asks to be shown to China by the messengers of Christianity are 'a passion for social justice' and 'genuine brotherly love.' It would seem from the testimonies in this book that these are aspects of the Christian religion which must be in the forefront if the 'global effort' is to become effective.

Japan and China—and what of India? How does the young Church there view the future that is opening before that land? Dr. Ashirvatham is not dismayed but exhilarated. He is in agreement with all the voices that come to us from the younger churches when he demands 'a united front' for the Indian churches. That is the way, he says, to 'an assured future,' and he believes the future to be assured. 'The Christian Indian has no need to despair of the future.' He 'can make a much greater contribution to a free India than to a subject India.'

If these are some of the voices with which the younger churches are speaking to us, what response do the old churches make to them? Dr. Stanley Jones, in the final contribution in the volume declares, 'the next great test within Christendom is to come together.' That certainly is a primary demand and it cannot be set aside whether the churches concerned are young or old. Dr. Francis Wei reports a conversation he had with an American as to his 'denomination.' 'What are you—a Methodist?' 'No, but I am methodical.' 'Are you a Presbyterian then?' 'No, but I am a presbyter.' 'Well, are you a Baptist?' 'I've been baptized but not that way.' 'Well, what are you—an Anglican?' 'Brother, just how can a Chinese be an Anglican?'

Again, the editor of 'The Christian Century' is

in agreement with the demand of the younger churches when he calls for missionaries who will 'prove their competence to examine the pretensions of the Governments of their own countries and the courage to hold these Governments to moral accountability.' The President of the Union Theological Seminary of New York urges the same view in his 'four guide-posts for Christian Missions.' These call for an end to nationalism and denominationalism in the new world.

If such new demands for the creation of the new world are to be carried into effect then we need to be up and doing, and Dr. Horton is right when he joins with Dr. Westman of Sweden in calling for a 'watch-tower or energizing centre' in every missionary area. It may even be that he is not merely dreaming dreams when he claims that through such energizing centres 'the full-blooded Christianity of the younger churches may revitalize the anæmic Christianity of the older churches.' Certainly a closer and more deeply integrated brotherhood between them will revitalize them both.

NICOL MACNICOL.

BARON VON HÜGEL.

To many, Baron von Hügel was a prophet sent from God, through whose message the divine voice carried plainly and unmistakably to their ears. And, since not a few of his disciples had themselves influential minds, telling in their turn markedly on others, his spiritual ministry, for that reason, as well as through its own native appeal, became widespread.

Yet there are those whom he hardly reached or touched at all; and who are frankly puzzled by the influence he wielded, and the enthusiasm he aroused.

Both schools will probably find corroboration of their views in *A Little Book of Baron von Hügel*, selected by P. Franklin Chambers (Geoffrey Bles; 5s. net).

All anthologies have the fundamental disadvantage that, inevitably, the reader is at the mercy of the editor's discernment and taste, and is apt to be irritated by the omission of this and that which would have been among his own first choices. But often, in this particular case for example, that is captious criticism. Mr. Chambers has done his work with skill. A devout admirer of von Hügel, he is enthusiastic, balanced, honest-minded, even critical at times, in a friendly fashion.

Many will be grateful for an introduction of forty pages of biographical matter and the like. As we would expect, it is a lovable and deeply spiritual personality that looks out at us from these pages. How fine to come upon this tribute: 'Two remarks were made about him which remain outstanding in memory of the conversation that took place in his old study—the look in his eyes when he spoke of God, and his care and consideration for little insignificant people, who sometimes came to him. He did not regard them as insignificant, if he felt they were sincere, and he thought he could help them—or learn from them.' There,

one imagines, we have got very near to some of the main sources of his impressive influence.

And yet, when one passes to the selected extracts, and studies them again, with the best will in the world to see what others have seen in them, the thrill they feel won't come; but obstinately, it all seems somewhat obvious and, at times, commonplace. The old enigma faces one, Why has this, to me, ordinary thinking, and often rather tortured writing, made such an impression upon many minds? Why has this, surely tame and uneventful compared to the depth and insight of the recognized masters and saints, been so belauded? There is much here, but not the inerrancy of touch of the supreme spiritual directors. In this little volume are we not told of two unhappy instances of grave misdirection of souls? It is all puzzling, not a little. Yet to explain it on the ground that the spiritual classics are not now much read, and that this newcomer, spared being tested against that trying background, looms up bigger than he really is, won't do. For some at least of those who praise him most were notably well read in his predecessors. It may be that the reader who does not feel the spell falls under Paul's condemnation, 'Neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.' But it may be that there has been overpraise. Each one had better read this book for himself, and so make up his mind whether this is a messenger from God to him, as it has been von Hügel's happy lot to be to many.

A. J. GOSSIP.

RELIGION AND OUR DIVIDED DENOMINATIONS.

In the admirable series which surveys 'Religion in the Post-War World,' the first volume deals with *Religion and our Divided Denominations* (Oxford University Press; 8s. 6d. net). The book, like the others in the series, has five divisions, each written by a specialist on his subject. Dean Sperry, the General Editor, leads the way with an essay on 'Our Present Disunity,' and he is followed by writers on Roman Catholicism, Protestantism, Judaism, and Cultural Humanism. We are told that the problem before the writers was how to preserve our heritage of religious freedom and at the same time devise ways of expressing our common spiritual life.

This volume apparently aims at an *eirenicon* by allowing each champion of the four 'religions' to explain the special tenets and claims of his faith, in the hope that when we understand one another we shall come nearer each other. The question to be settled first is whether our divisions are a 'scandal.' Why should they be so regarded? Why should we look at religious division as any more disreputable than political division? We do not think of Socialists or Conservatives as being guilty of continuing an 'unhappy' state of things. Why should the separate churches be guilty of any scandal by following their own way of thinking? The present demand for union of the churches is founded on something which is unreal and undesirable. We shall never get people to

think alike—why should they? What we *can* aim at is a federation of churches which are all Christian and have the same essential creed, and which, being federated, will be able to speak with one voice on the Christian point of view.

At the same time it is desirable that we should comprehend the points on which Romanists differ from Protestants and Jews from both. This will at least minister to charity and show how far our common Christian witness can be expressed. And of course this knowledge is immensely interesting in itself. And the book before us is therefore of great value. Each of the specialist writers sets down what he and his fellow believers really hold by, and, as this is done excellently, the book is particularly interesting and of permanent worth.

F. J. RAE.

THE WAY.

Concerning the Way, by the Rev. F. C. Bryan (S.C.M.; 6s. net), is a grave, sensible, careful book of advice on the Christian way of living, from which an earnest reader will receive suggestion and stimulus. Its practical outlook may be illustrated by this sentence, 'The Christian must care about the housing question because a good family life is part of God's plan for man, and to talk of family life is a mockery unless the family can be housed in dignity and decency.' Of the Christian way of life it is said that it has a 'quality not to be found in the natural man who lives merely by his natural instincts, nor in the dutiful citizen who lives merely according to the law; it is a quality that appears only in the lives of those who love as God loves.'

But this kind of easy, copious writing can be prosy. For example, 'There will always be three fundamental requirements for which, whether we like it or not, we have to find time if we are to maintain ourselves in health and provide the wherewithal to live. We must find time for sleep, for meals, and for the work whereby we earn our livelihood.' 'The Table of the Lord is not to be approached presumptuously. Let a man examine himself lest by eating and drinking without realizing what he is doing he should eat and drink to his own condemnation.' 'But of this more will be said later. Suffice it now to point out . . .' And Mr. Bryan is always cautious. 'Others feel that in the case of people with small incomes a tithe may be too much and in the case of people with large incomes, too little.'

In spite of many apt illustrations it all makes a rather heavy little volume full of sound teaching wrapped up in many words. More patient readers however may not feel critical in this, after all, superficial fashion, and for them it will be a mine of wisdom.

R. W. STEWART.

Religion and the Family, by Geoffrey Hoyland (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net), contains two series of broadcast addresses which were given over the wireless under the titles, 'The Family Gang' and 'Home, Children and Religion.' They have been

re-written and combined in this book. The subject is dealt with in an unconventional fashion which will appeal to the average reader, and it would be a decided blessing if youth as well as age were to read Mr. Hoyland's wise words. The subject, of course, is of vital importance at a time when the break-up of family life is a constant subject of discussion. Mr. Hoyland deals with the causes of this break-up, and ways in which it may be prevented. All the problems of family life are brought under review from an unusual angle and the talks are both lively and interesting.

It would be a great gain if politicians were to realize that the essential basis of any valid national reconstruction is a spiritual one, and that in Christianity reformers will find the necessary vision and stimulus. It is in this conviction that the Rev. Mervyn Stockwood has set down a reasoned statement of his Christian faith in *There is a Tide* (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net). He has done this admirably in eleven brief chapters. These chapters cover the main ground of belief. Six chapters deal with the person and work of Christ, three with the Church, and the two last chapters with Holy Communion and prayer. It would be difficult to recommend a better book within the limits of space to which the author has resigned himself.

The Unity of the Church in the New Testament (Almqvist and Wiksells Boktryckeri, Uppsala; 10 crowns) is the fourteenth number in the series, *Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis*, edited by A. Fridrichsen. The learned and scholarly author of this number is Stig Hanson. He has read widely in Continental, British, and American theological literature, and he has spared no pains to present an up-to-date conspectus of expositions and interpretations. The main part of the volume is devoted to a study of the idea of the Unity of the Church in Pauline theology, with a special examination of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and also, to a certain degree, the Epistle to the Colossians. This is followed by a cursory glance at John and Ignatius and preceded by a study of the Synoptists, who form the link between Judaism and the Pauline theology in this matter of the idea of unity. The Pastoral Epistles, Hebrews, Acts, and the Catholic Epistles hardly afford, it is said, any original contributions to the New Testament idea of unity. As one might anticipate, the volume is supplied with a satisfying bibliography and careful indexes of authors, passages, and subjects.

The Rev. Norman Macleish, M.A., B.Phil., Professor of Theology at Ormond College, Melbourne (who went there from a parochial charge in Scotland), has published an essay on the Sinlessness of Jesus, entitled *Ideal Manhood* (Angus & Robertson; 2s. 6d. net). He finds that Ullmann's monograph on this subject is both out of date and hard to obtain; and the statement he here offers is as untechnical and practical as he can make it. The question he seeks to answer is, 'What evidence is there that Jesus was not only the world's

greatest moral and religious teacher, but the one and only Perfect Man, to do Whose will is to do the revealed will of God Himself? The evidence of bystanders, of the disciples, and of Jesus Himself is discussed. It is maintained that while the sinlessness of Jesus is something which cannot be demonstrated, it is also something of which we can be reasonably sure, because it is implied by what we know of His character as revealed in His manner of living and dying. But others say that the ground of our certainty is not what we know of His character as thus revealed but our experience of His ability to save us from our sins. Professor Macleish, however, thinks the two explanations can be reconciled.

The God of the Christians, by Dom Augustine Morris (Dacre Press; 5s. net), belongs to a series of publications called 'Mirfield Books.' Their aim is 'to give clear and orthodox teaching about fundamentals of Catholic Faith and Morals, and they are being edited by a Committee of Members of the Community of the Resurrection, Mirfield, Yorks. They are intended to fulfil what the famous 'Tracts for the Times' did for the Oxford Movement. This volume in the series, a slim and attractively printed book of a hundred and twenty-five pages, is concerned with the knowledge of God we gain 'by rising from the objects of the universe to the contemplation of God their Maker and Cause.' The other ways of knowledge—through the record of God's revelation and through contact with God in prayer are, according to the author, to be largely left aside. From this point of view the title of the book is misleading and inappropriate. What is given here is a diligent résumé of Catholic thought in the field of Natural Theology under such chapter headings as God as Simple, Eternal, Omnipotent, Holy and Just, Loving and Merciful, etc. There is a fine devotional quality in this simple writing but we think that has led to an over emphasis upon what reason can yield us. It is noteworthy, for example, that the chapter on the Love and Mercy of God can hardly move a step in exposition except by a liberal use of Scripture and the testimony of Saints! There is a too naïve quality in Catholic rationalism; it finds too much outside the specific sphere of revelation and within that sphere it tends to miss what is most crucial. What really makes this book pleasureable and profitable to read is that it presupposes an amount of Christian knowledge of God which its professed remit does not allow!

An original and admirably told story of the life of David is contained in *Dream David*, by Miss Eileen Marsh (Lutterworth Press; 5s. net). A little boy called David has a series of dreams in which he meets his great namesake and sees all he does and listens to his songs. A really fine children's book.

The Heart of Religion, by the Rev. W. Francis Gibbons, B.D. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 5s. net), is a winsome little book of some one hundred and thirty pages, which may well have an uplift

for many if they give it its chance. It consists of thirty studies of 'some vital New Testament truths concerning Christ and ourselves.' They are short and simple, but suggestive, and even appealing. Mr. Gibbons has read, often well away from the beaten tracks, and with an eye in his head for a good thing. Hence there are many apt and telling illustrations from biography and from literature, which open up vistas, and set the reader's mind in motion. And he has himself brooded over the deep things, and sets down the conclusions he has reached with vividness and point. He is a man of his own time, speaking to the people of his own time; and he does it well, using the lucidity and brevity which makes appeal to them.

Year's Journey, by Mr. Hugh Redwood (National Sunday School Union; 5s. net), is a book of Bible readings, or, rather, it is a book in which Mr. Redwood sets down the thoughts provoked by Bible reading by one who had no hand in choosing the passages. It need not be said that the comments are always interesting and spiritually valuable. They are very short, two in a page, and go on from January first to December thirty-first.

Recalling the Scottish Covenants, by Dr. Hugh Watt, Principal of New College, Edinburgh, and Professor of Church History in New College (Nelson; 6s. net), is an important book. It will recall Scottish readers to some of the great events of their past, and, it is to be hoped, will enlighten English people on the great issues that have been raised in the fight for liberty. If the average Scottish churchman was asked, What was the Solemn League and Covenant?, What was the National Covenant?, it is to be feared few would be able to answer. Dr. Watt has given the answer in this book. But he has done a great deal more. He has shed light on obscure passages in Scottish history, and he has produced a book that is admirably written and constantly and deeply interesting. One of the most fascinating essays in the book is his estimate of Laud. In his youth Laud was to Dr. Watt one of the two villains of Scots history. The other was 'fause' Menteith. Later he took a far more favourable view of Laud, but, after a recent careful study of the documents he has returned to his youthful judgment and passes here a hostile verdict on his real aims and loyalties. But this chapter on Laud is only one of several that enlighten and attract from the knowledge they display and the attractive style in which they are written.

A very interesting and, to ministers, a useful book is *The Vicarious Life*, by the Very Rev. George C. Pidgeon, D.D. (Oxford University Press; 10s. 6d. net). It contains a series of sermons preached from the pulpit of Bloor Street United Church, Toronto. The author is a distinguished minister of the United Church of Canada of which he was the first Moderator. These sermons are the fruit of a lectureship on Christian Ethics. In the delivery of lectures on this subject the author

felt the need of a restatement of the central principle of Christian obligation, and this he found in Christ's self-giving for man's salvation. Moreover, in his own social welfare work he found the vicarious spirit at work everywhere, which was a reflection of the Master's mind. This, Jesus saw, was the only thing by which the world could be saved. Dr. Pidgeon has thought out the application of this principle in human, and even sub-human life. It is a principle wrought into the fabric of all life. And in his book we find most engrossing chapters on the Vicarious Principle in Literature, in the Old Testament, in Temptation (dealing with the Temptation of Jesus), in the Cross, and in the Resurrection. There are other relevant themes, and they are all illustrated by well-chosen incidents from life and history and from writers old and new.

The Religious Education Press have issued the *Handbook* for the third year of the Intermediate Course at 4s. 6d. net. The subjects are The King and His Kingdom, The Epistles for To-day, Understanding the Christian Faith, The Harvest of Man's Mind and Imagination, and The Road to Bethlehem. It will be sufficient to say that the same thoroughness, the same fertility in illustration, the same analytic clearness and the same understanding of the youthful mind are evident in this volume as in previous ones. Excellent for Bible Class work.

Satan, A Portrait: A Study of the Character of Satan through the Ages, by the Rev. Edward Langton, D.D., F.R.Hist.S., F.R.A.S. (Skeffington; 12s. 6d. net). So runs the title of a book from one who has long toiled on these and kindred themes. As the Preface puts it, 'To many eminent Christian thinkers and teachers of to-day the conception of Satan no longer represents an objective reality. It is rather an embarrassing survival from ancient modes of thought. Frequently it is altogether ignored by those who seek to set forth the main principles of Christian teaching. The present work is not an attempt to rehabilitate the conception of Satan. The writer's aim is rather to trace the idea of Satan from its source onwards; to consider its many developments, and the causes of them; to note its connexion with many bygone modes of thought, some of them the strangest vagaries that have ever found a hospitable home in the minds of men. It is hoped, however, that the evidence presented will be useful in assisting perplexed theologians and others in their attempt to estimate the amount of reality which can reasonably be held to attach to this age-long conception.'

That is a hope which may well be realized. For this is a learned little volume, built upon broad bases of knowledge, and written with sobriety and balance. It is wide-flung, embraces the whole subject, and is liberally documented. The Old Testament, Rabbinical literature, Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature, the New Testa-

ment, Early Christian Literature, Scholastic Literature, Monastic Literature, such are some of the first chapter headings. And the subject is pursued down through the ages, till we reach certain nineteenth century attempts to re-state the conception; and then its fading out; and finally a grave consideration of the questions whether we have been well advised to be so curt in our dismissal of a doctrine to which many of the greatest spiritual geniuses subscribed; and whether the whole matter ought not to receive a much larger measure of attention than it does.

The Existence of God, by the Rev. Eric G. Jay of the Faculty of Theology in King's College, London, (S.P.C.K.; 4s. 6d. net), is a useful commentary on the famous *quinque viae* of St. Thomas Aquinas (his five ways of demonstrating the existence of God). The author of this volume subscribes faithfully to the Thomist teaching on natural theology, rejecting with the master the Anselmian Ontological Argument and upholding the method of inferential *a posteriori* proof. He does not even follow Mr. Mascall, also a faithful neo-Thomist, in the new interpretation of the 'third way' (from contingency to necessity), but defends the validity of the argument as usually stated and interpreted. In his opinion the *quinque viae* is 'the most masterly, concise and forceful statement of the reasons for belief in God ever produced by a Christian thinker.' It is a large claim, and there are many theistic thinkers nowadays who refute the inferential method. But the author of this volume well deserves a hearing. In any case we are indebted to him for his simple and lucid expositions of the various Thomist arguments. It should be added that though we have used technical terms of the theistic tradition in characterizing his pages, his treatment throughout is in quite untechnical language, and admirably fulfils its purpose of assisting theological students at the beginning of their studies.

Natural Law in the Bible is Reprint No. 17 from 'Theology' (S.P.C.K.; 6d. net). The writer of the article is Professor C. H. Dodd, D.D., who contends for the recognition in the Bible of the Principle of the Law of Nature, although the Bible, in both Testaments, is concerned with a supernatural revelation communicated in history. 'In Christ,' as he concludes, 'man is confronted with that Word, Wisdom, or Law which is the law of his creation, the same which was partially disclosed to Israel in the Torah, and is known in some measure to all mankind, through conscience and reason, as the Law of Nature.'

Few popular expositors of Scripture have ever appealed to so varied and extensive an audience as the late Dr. G. Campbell Morgan. Many of his old hearers will welcome his *Notes on the Psalms* (Walter; 8s. 6d. net), a volume which gives a brief summary of each Psalm, and includes several of those diagrams with which Dr. Morgan's readers are already familiar.

The Religious Value of Sacrifice.

By PROFESSOR C. J. CADOUX, M.A., D.D., D.LITT., OXFORD.

FROM the earliest times the Jewish people clearly regarded sacrifices as an integral part of their religious worship. What then are we to make of those few passages, in the Psalms and the writings of the pre-exilic prophets, in which this system is to all appearance denounced as not enjoined by God and not acceptable to Him?

The general tendency among critical scholars of an earlier day was to take these passages at their face-value, and regard them as implying a real rejection of sacrificial worship in itself, on the ground apparently of its unspiritual character.¹ This was a natural view for moderns to take, who of course find it none too easy to sympathize with so unfamiliar a usage.

More recently the pendulum has swung in the opposite direction; and many scholars are now prepared to see in these passages a rejection of sacrifice *only when divorced from an honest moral intention*. Two good reasons can be advanced in support of this view. (1) In some of the strongest passages condemning sacrifice (*e.g.* Am 5, Is 1), the condemnation is accompanied by grave insistence on a higher moral standard. (2) It was a usual Jewish practice to get emphasis by means of hyperbole, *i.e.* to word a statement more strongly than was really meant, in order to compel attention. Thus, when Hosea says (6^o), 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice,' it is quite possible, if not certain, that all he meant was, 'I desire mercy more than sacrifice,' or 'I do not desire sacrifice without mercy.' We could fittingly quote in support of such interpretation a saying of Jesus: 'If therefore thou art offering thy gift at the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go away, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.'² A persuasive apologia on these lines for the Jewish sacrifices has been advanced by Dr. H. H. Rowley of Manchester, in his recent book, *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament* (1946).³ He does indeed say

of the pre-exilic prophets: 'we have no means of knowing what they would have said of sacrifice that was the organ of obedience' (p. 109); but later in the book, he is somewhat more positive: '*When sacrifice has any meaning at all*, it presents to God man's plea for help and equally the pledge of his willingness to receive it.'⁴ He argues that post-exilic Judaism, with its enhanced stress on sacrifice and other cultic details, is not to be judged as less spiritual than the pre-exilic prophets, whose works it cherished and edited, but that it took the same view as they did about sacrifice being of value only when it was accompanied by a serious religious and moral intention, and that it regarded otherwise trifling details as important, because they were the Will of God (pp. 118-123).

There is undoubtedly force in these arguments. The inclusion of writings denouncing sacrifice in the same collection of sacred books as writings enjoining them certainly suggests at first sight that the collectors were unconscious of any insuperable contradiction between them. And why not? Sacrifice is, after all, but a conventional symbol—like language, only less frequently needed. Words, as mere sounds (unless they are exclamatory or onomatopœic), are meaningless; they are charged with meaning simply because meaning has been conventionally and by custom associated with them. Hence their value. So with many familiar actions—smiling, frowning, hand-shaking, bowing, uncovering the head, etc. It is the same with the observances of religion—circumcision, baptism, genuflection, the wearing of tassels (Dt 22¹², Nu 15³⁷⁻⁴⁰, Mt 9²⁰ 14³⁶), and indeed all the external usages of the cult. It was only natural that, among an ancient and religiously-minded people, all long-established symbolic acts should be hallowed by their very antiquity, and believed to have been directly ordained by God. Seeing that some such symbols are indispensable, God is doubtless pleased to receive and bless them. That, when hypocritically used, they are unpleasing to Him, and that, like untruthful speech, they should then be denounced by the prophets, is only what we should expect.

Are we then to say that the inherent quality of the symbol was entirely irrelevant, that anything would do, provided only it were ancient and were sincerely performed? One clear example at least

¹ See, for example, E. Kautzsch's discussion in his massive article on 'The Religion of Israel' in *Hastings' DB* v. (1904) 685 f.

² Mt 5^{23f.}. Cf. Mk 1⁴⁴ ('offer for thy cleansing the things which Moses commanded . . .'); Lk 17¹⁴.

³ See pp. 109-112, 117, 119, 156 f., 165. He adds the argument that Deuteronomy 'is commonly held to rest on the teaching of the eighth-century prophets. . . . Yet Deuteronomy also prescribes the offering of sacrifices. . . .' (p. 111).

⁴ P. 157: italics mine. Cf. p. 167 ('It bore to God the pledge of his loyalty and obedience, . . .').

shows that this was not so. Child-sacrifice was a long-established usage among many Semitic peoples; and there is no reason to believe that it was insincerely practised—on the contrary, its extreme costliness vouches for the genuineness of the motives behind it. It had apparently been at one time customary in Israel; but in the period covered by the Old Testament writings, the conscience of the nation was set against it, though it was still occasionally practised. The prophets emphatically condemned it, not because it could not serve as a vehicle for sincere worship, but clearly because in its inherent character it represented an immoral violation of the victims' personal rights.

Now we must not, as modern humanitarians, argue that the same or even an analogous objection must have been felt to animal-sacrifice. The Hebrew conscience was but rarely stirred by regard for animal life. Yet it is not unlikely that doubts sometimes arose in the ancient Hebrew mind as to whether animal-sacrifice, however sincerely offered, was a form of worship which God really desired. The old heathenish ideas that God physically enjoyed the *smell* of the burning flesh (Gn 8²¹, Ex 29¹⁸, etc.),¹ and that He and His worshippers shared in the common sacrificial meal, though obsolete or evanescent, were still remembered, and must have struck the more thoughtful as unworthy. Moreover, the inherent futility of killing a beast, hewing its carcass in pieces, tossing basinsfuls of its blood in this place and that, and finally burning its remains in whole or in part, could hardly have failed to come home sooner or later to spiritual minds, however different their general attitude to such things may have been from our own.

A further interesting consideration is that the only explanation of sacrifice which later Jewish thinkers felt able to give of the real meaning of sacrifice was the supposition that God had commanded it²—a clear indication of the irrational character which it had come to possess. No idea of it serving as a 'pledge' of obedience, and so on, seems ever to have been expressed.

If, against the background of these general considerations, we study again the more emphatic of the anti-sacrificial utterances in the Old Testament, we cannot but doubt whether the reduced meaning which modern interpreters incline to give them does them full justice. Let us look.

(a) Jer 7²¹: 'For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning

burnt offerings or sacrifices: but this thing I commanded them, saying, Hearken unto my voice . . . and walk ye in all the way that I command you, that it may be well with you.'

About this passage Dr. Rowley remarks (pp. 111 f.): 'This is taken to be a categorical denial that sacrifice had ever had any legitimate place in the religion of Yahwism. It is quite incredible that Jeremiah should have meant any such thing.' The only ground mentioned in support of this judgment is the plea that, if Jesus could require a follower to 'hate' his parents and other relatives (Lk 14²⁶), Jeremiah could use a similar hyperbole in contending that obedience was *more important* than sacrifice.

Loth as I am to differ from so great an authority as Dr. Rowley, I must confess myself unconvinced by this reasoning. That hyperbole is frequently found in the Bible is undeniable; and I have myself drawn attention to the large use made of it.³ But its frequency does not mean that a Biblical writer could never make a strong statement which he intended to be taken at its face-value. The clear words of Jeremiah are not contradicted by anything else he wrote, or by any other fact which we know about him.⁴ And certainly the analogy of Lk 14²⁶ gives little support to Dr. Rowley's view. The word 'to hate' in Hebrew, and probably also in the Aramaic which Jesus used, had a weak as well as a strong sense, and could quite well mean simply 'to love less.'⁵ Unless therefore some positive reason can be given for believing that Jeremiah was using hyperbole, we must allow him to mean seriously what he says.

(b) Mic 6⁶⁻⁸:

'Wherewith shall I come before Yahweh,
And bow myself before the high God?
Shall I come before him with burnt offerings,
With calves of a year old? . . .
Shall I give my first-born for my transgression,
The fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?
He hath shown thee, O man, what is good:
And what doth Yahweh require of thee,
but to do justly, and to love mercy,
and to walk humbly with thy God?'

Dr. Rowley comments (pp. 110 f.): 'There is nothing here to indicate that men who showed the

¹ In THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lii (1941), 378-381.

² That he was 'of the priests that were in Anathoth' (Jer 1¹) does not of necessity imply that he personally officiated. We never hear of his doing so. Moreover, Anathoth was the place in which Abiathar, who was ejected from the practical priesthood, in favour of Zadok, had settled (1 K 2^{26f.}; see also A. S. Peake, *Jeremiah* [Century Bible], i. 3, 79, 152 f.).

³ In Gn 29^{30f.}, we read that Jacob 'loved Rachel more than Leah,' and that 'Yahweh saw that Leah was hated.' Dr. Skinner's note on this is: 'The rendering is too strong. אָהַב is almost a technical term for the less favoured of two wives (Dt 21^{18ff.}); . . .' (*Genesis* [I.C.C.], 385).

⁴ 'If it be Yahweh that hath stirred thee up against me, let him *smell an offering*,' says David to Saul (1 S 26¹⁹).

⁵ G. B. Gray, *Sacrifice in the O.T.*, 51, 81, 329, 381 f.

qualities asked for would not also desire to offer sacrifices Possibly so; but Micah *does* indicate it that God would not require it. Otherwise, why the formula, 'What doth Yahweh require of thee, but . . . ?' This surely implies that the ensuing enumeration is *exhaustive*, thus excluding sacrifice.

(c) The third instance I select is Ps 51, a penitent's prayer. The prayer proper concludes as follows (vv.^{18f.}):

For thou delightest not in sacrifice; that I should give it:

Thou hast no pleasure in burnt offering.

The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit:

A broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.

But as the Psalm stands in our Bible, two more verses follow (18^{f.}):

'Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion:

Build thou the walls of Jerusalem.

Then shalt thou delight thyself in the correct sacrifices, in burnt offering and whole burnt offering;

Then shall they offer bullocks upon thine altar.'

Now it is as clear as daylight that these last verses are a gloss written by a different writer from the author of vv.¹⁻¹⁷. Note the difference in the content and interest. The author of vv.¹⁻¹⁷ is not interested in animal-sacrifice, and states categorically that God does not require it. Neither does he display any interest in Jerusalem. His words about sacrifice were clearly dangerous doctrine; and a later editor accordingly added vv.^{18f.} to remedy the defect. Had the author of vv.¹⁻¹⁷ meant to reject only insincere sacrifice, he would not have added references to Jerusalem, and to Jews in general offering bullocks, etc.; he would surely have added *in the first person* a promise to offer some on his own account, as a 'pledge' of his sincere repentance. It is significant that he does nothing of the sort.

If it be conceded that at least these three passages contain a real dismissal of sacrifice as a needless and divinely unauthorized method of worship, the presumption is created that the same simple meaning will attach to some at least of the other anti-sacrificial passages (such as Am 5²⁵, Ps 40⁶ 50⁷⁻¹⁵); and this presumption is, I submit, strengthened by the fact that not one of all these passages is accompanied by any explicit declaration on the part of its author that, if the heart is pure, the sacrifice will then be a suitable adjunct or organ of worship.

We must then conclude that:

(a) Although sacrifice may have served as a genuine organ of worship for many simple-minded and sincere Jews,

(b) it was, on account of its inherent quality,

seen by the more enlightened to be an unsuitable organ;

(c) that Judaism, with its stress on sacrificial and other ritualistic detail, was exposed to a danger¹ which it by no means escaped, and which made it the half-way house to that externalism which Jesus deplored, and which is so repellently obvious in the Mishna;

(d) that the inclusion of inconsistent estimates of sacrifice within the same group of sacred books constitutes no disproof of the foregoing; it is paralleled by similar incongruities which show that the Jewish mind was not over-sensitive to logical inconsistency, unless it was exceptionally glaring. Ps 51¹⁶⁻¹⁹ is a good illustration of the way in which they preferred to deal with the more obvious cases.

I must not digress to discuss further the personal attitude of Jesus to the sacrificial cult. There is no evidence that He set Himself explicitly against it. On the other hand, His positive allusions to it reveal little more than a tacit acceptance of what all Jews took for granted as a long-standing religious usage, though His general unconcern and impatience over the stress men laid on the external details of the cult would incline us to suppose that He laid little stress on it Himself.

I want rather to devote my closing lines to commenting on the use of the sacrificial idea of the Old Testament for the purpose of interpreting the doctrine of the Atonement. Dr. Rowley insists on the close relation between the two: the Jewish sacrificial system was superseded only by the sacrificial death of Christ, which can be rightly understood only in the light of that system; those who refuse to accept the sacrificial significance of His death 'part company with the New Testament, as well as cut adrift from the Old' (p. 165); the reason they deny this significance is either a humanistic desire to reduce 'the stature of Christ to the level of a mere hero and example,' and to find 'the springs of man's redemption in himself . . .,' or a desire to safeguard belief in the love of God, a belief produced by man's faith and repentance. He rejects the latter argument by urging that man is not saved by his own faith and repentance, but by the power of God; and he rejects the former by pointing out that the New Testament represents Jesus as our High Priest who, *as our representative*, offers to God in His sacrifice our penitence, surrender, and faith. On this basis Dr. Rowley founds an exposition both of the Atonement and of the Eucharist (pp. 165-170).

I cannot but feel that, in the light of the foregoing study of the highest Old Testament teaching on the subject of sacrifice, there is some over-

¹ So Rowley, pp. 119, 156.

statement here. Apart from the problematic words spoken at the Last Supper, Jesus only once uses sacrificial language about His death, when He speaks of 'giving his life as a ransom for many' (Mk 10⁴⁵)—an expression to which a metaphorical or illustrative interpretation can be given without the slightest difficulty.¹ There is more about the death of Jesus as a sacrifice in the Pauline Epistles; but I doubt whether even there one can insist that the connexion is more than illustrative. Paul, for instance, makes a very realistic comparison between sacrifice and the charitable gifts of the Philippians (Ph 4¹⁸); yet theologians have not insisted on a sacrificial interpretation of Christian almsgiving.

Still less can the High-priesthood of Christ be pressed as an indispensable Christian idea, except illustratively; for, in the New Testament, it is virtually confined to the non-Pauline and long-unaccepted Epistle to the Hebrews. Why does no one else insist on it?

So much for the charge of 'parting company with the New Testament.' The experiential view

of the Atonement, which regards Jesus' death as the means by which our penitence and faith are stirred, does not in the least lower the stature of Christ, make man his own redeemer, or throw doubt on the assurance that he is saved by the grace and power of God. On the other hand, to insist on the sacrificial idea as *the key* to the problem clearly involves the idea that Jesus' main work is to 'represent' our penitence and faith to God. This view seems to me to make harder the acceptance of what our Lord Himself revealed as the core of His gospel, namely, that the *most fundamental* relations of God towards men are the personal and affectionate relations of Fatherhood.

¹ The same may be said of Is 53¹⁰—the one allusion to sacrifice in the Servant-Poems. To call this expression an 'indication that it is by the sacrificial offering which God Himself provides in His Servant that men are transmuted and prepared to be citizens of the kingdom' (Rowley, p. 200) is, in my judgment, to read into the poem more than is really there. The redemptive change wrought in the poet is clearly the work, not of a sacrificial offering, but of the Servant's heroic self-denial.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

By-Passing Winter.

BY THE REVEREND R. OSWALD DAVIES,
MANCHESTER.

'Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven.'—Mt 6²⁰.

By now, all our summer visitors have left our shores. The swallows, swifts, cuckoos, nightingales, they have all departed for warmer and brighter countries. We shall not see them again until next spring-time. That is because they cannot stand the hard, wintry weather of England. But what of the other little creatures that cannot so easily fly away? What will happen to them? How will they spend the coming winter? Well, most of them by now have gone to sleep. There is the hedgehog, for instance. He seeks out a good-sized hole in the hedgerow, perhaps one made by a wasps' nest. He fills it with dried leaves and moss to make it warm and cosy. Then he curls himself round in it and goes to sleep, snug and warm, for the winter. . . Sometimes, if it happens to be a fine day, he wakes up and forages around for a meal and goes back to sleep again. One of the soundest sleepers of winter is that delightful little creature, the dormouse. He is only five and a half inches long, tail and all. He makes a special winter's nest

of moss and grass under the roots of trees, or even deep underground. There he falls into a deep sleep. Should you find him asleep and pick him up in your hand you would say, 'How cold he is, surely he is dead.' And no wonder, for he does not even breathe! But he is not dead. Indeed, he, too, may wake up some fine day in winter and make a meal of the store of nuts which lies beside him, and when spring comes he will wake up as fresh as ever.

'How strange,' you may say, 'that the hedgehog, the dormouse and some other wild creatures sleep through the long winter.' What is the meaning of it? It is all a question of rations. Food, as we know, is not to be found so easily in winter as in summer. Some wild creatures do not go to sleep, and they have a hard time. Many of them, especially the birds that stay with us, even perish before the hard winter is over. But the hibernating animals, as we call them, settle the problem by just going to sleep. They by-pass the winter. That is how they overcome their difficulty. What a lesson there is here for us all. Don't say of any difficulty that it cannot be overcome. Never say that some task you have to face is impossible. God has given to you certain gifts, and with their aid you ought to be able to conquer all your difficulties.

But, surely, you will say, it is a long time to sleep through the winter practically without any

food. How do they manage it? The secret is reserves. Throughout the summer and autumn they have been feasting on the good things of the earth. An abundant supply of food has been available, and by the time they fall into their winter's sleep they are fat and sleek. Their little bodies have stored up reserves of fat and energy which will keep them alive during their long winter's sleep. It is all a question of reserves. How important this is for ourselves as well. We cannot live well without reserves. The boy who runs a race needs to call upon his last ounce of strength for the last lap. The business man needs them in his business to meet an emergency. It is so with the good life. What are these reserves? They are goodness, honesty, love, and beauty. These are the finest reserves. Jesus said, 'Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven.' I believe that He meant just this. He was thinking of reserves—those treasures which we can always draw upon in times of great need. There lies, Jesus said, the secret of the good life. It is reserves. That is what you are doing when you attend church and Sunday school. You are storing up reserves for the future. And some day how glad you will be to find that you have these reserves.

Where the Englishman's Word is His Bond.

BY THE REVEREND REGINALD G. ASHMAN,
STOCKPORT.

'A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches, and loving favour rather than silver and gold.'—Pr 22¹.

Those words I saw some years ago inscribed in letters of gold in Manchester's largest building. This magnificent building would hold ten thousand people, the floor space covering over an acre and a quarter, but unlike most buildings of that size which are used for public meetings, concerts, or exhibitions this building was used until blitzed solely as a meeting place for business men who came from all parts of the world.

What is the name of this vast building? It is the 'Manchester Royal Exchange.' The friend who took me to see it had been a member for forty-five years. It was on a Friday afternoon, and he said that on Tuesdays and Fridays between 2 o'clock and 4 o'clock there are often as many as seven thousand people there. As I looked down from the strangers' gallery upon the huge crowd of business men moving hither and thither I said to my friend, 'However can any one find the business man he wants to see?' 'Oh,' he said, 'that is very simple.'

The floor is marked with intersecting lines like a school map. Each member has his appointed place on the map so that all one has to do is to inquire the latitude and longitude of Mr. So-and-So and then go straight for the spot.

Then, looking up, I saw these words in golden letters inscribed round the dome. 'A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches, and loving favour rather than silver and gold.' 'What a splendid motto,' I remarked to my friend, 'for

such a building.' 'Yes,' he said, 'and, what is more, the Exchange has a name for living up to it. It has the reputation of high business honour and integrity. During my forty-five years' connexion I cannot remember any big dispute.'

You cannot see the force of this unless you remember that the price of cotton and other goods is always changing. There is a large board like a cricket-scoring board in the hall which gives the price of cotton to-day. But to-morrow it may be higher or lower. A business man agrees first of all *verbally*, that is, by word of mouth, to buy cotton to-day at such and such a price. To-morrow the price may have altered, which means he may stand to lose or gain. But having made an agreement he *sticks to his word*.

Now, boys and girls, we have a saying that an Englishman's word is his bond. And that is exactly what we want your words to be. We want you little folk to grow up to be men and women of integrity—that is, men and women whose word can always be relied on—so that what you promise to-day you will do to-morrow.

There is nothing which causes more sorrow and misery in the world than when people break their word, when they refuse to carry out something they promised to do.

I know the temptation is strong to break our word when we see we may lose by keeping it, but, if we do break our word, what we gain in money we lose in honour, what we gain in goods we lose in goodness.

The Christian Year.

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

A Modern Picture of Hell.

BY THE REVEREND R. W. STEWART, B.D., B.Sc.,
KILLERMONT.

'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.'—Mt 19¹⁹.

Professor Eddington's book called *The Expanding Universe* is not every man's meat. As an astronomer he deals with the inconceivable distances explored by the telescope. He puts down figures of million times millions and mathematical formulas few can follow. Yet its central idea is simple enough and did to some extent catch the popular fancy. The book marks the curious fact that all the distant nebulae that the telescope can discern are rushing away from this earth at terrific speeds, and the farther away they are the faster they are moving. What can the explanation be? It is difficult to see how all can be impelled to withdraw from the neighbourhood of our system. If their motion was by chance the expectation would be that some would be approaching. Why this universal velocity of retreat?

Eddington's explanation is that the whole universe is expanding like a balloon. Blow up a rubber balloon and every spot on its surface gets farther away from every other spot, and the farther away the spots were to begin with the quicker

the distance between them increases. So, while the nebulae appear to be unanimously rushing away from the earth, what is really happening is that the whole universe is expanding, and more and more quickly, like a bursting balloon.

In his last book, *The Great Divorce*, Mr. Lewis seems to have borrowed a notion from Eddington. He is trying with his own mixture of humour, poetry, and seriousness to describe the difference between heaven and hell, and this is his picture of hell. It is a vast grey empty city stretching on all sides farther than the eye can reach. Why so large and so empty? Because each new arrival, after building his house, quarrels with his neighbour and moves farther out. Everyone has the same urge. So the city is constantly expanding on the fringe. The centre is abandoned streets. The whole population is on the move out to the free space beyond the suburbs where they can get away from one another. The enormous grey derelict town sprawling in space is a monument to the refusal of fellowship. This, says Mr. Lewis, is one description of hell, not the fiery torment of Biblical and mediæval fancy but a dull, drab, endless, self-centred effort to escape from contact with others into a loveless isolation. In this mortal life conditions make complete escape impossible. We have to rub along as best we can even at the price of irritation. We cannot altogether keep ourselves to ourselves. But what if after death there are no controlling circumstances that bind people together even against their will and make contacts inevitable? What if hell means that the bad can do as they like, and what they like is to shun all companionship and become a dreary host of sour souls pursuing the aim of greater isolation? It is a picture to give one 'the creeps.'

If there is any true suggestiveness in this picture it may be said with some right that there are those who begin life in hell while they are still on earth.

One of I. A. R. Wylie's novels contains the doggerel rhyme:

I wish I liked the human race,
I wish I liked its silly face,
I wish I liked the way it walks,
I wish I liked the way it talks,
And when I'm introduced to one
I wish I thought 'what jolly fun.'

That hits off the snifty, supercilious attitude some adopt towards their neighbours, despising and rejecting the opportunities life brings of friendship and fellowship. Their desire seems to be, in the words of the Roman poet Juvenal, 'to love no one and be loved by none.' They would dwell apart in morose solitude. This mood has even been made a philosophy of life, as in the story famous in antiquity about Diogenes the cynic who lived in a tub. 'Can I serve you in any way?' Alexander the Great asked him. 'Yes,' was the surly answer, 'you can stand out of my light.'

To one living in such a black fog of sullenness that curious little phrase in Hosea might be

applied, 'a wild ass alone by himself.' But he is not happy, as one may suppose the wild ass to be, however foolish. His loneliness is as miserable as hell.

There are of course any number of places in Scripture commending the other way of life, the way of fellowship; among them is this word of Christ, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' The word 'love' links the two great commandments of love to God and love to men, and the reason is obvious. It is absurd to imagine men loving God, who loves them all, and at the same time hating one another. Our attitude to one another is in fact inevitably part of our religion. To believe that all are God's creatures, made for a life of fellowship and set together to dwell on this habitable earth as objects of His Fatherly care, makes it an essential part of religion to enter into relations of friendship and fellowship with them, with as many as possible of them, with all the eagerness and joy and sympathy of which we are capable. 'Love to our neighbour,' said Herrmann, the author of that classic, *Communion with God*, 'is joy in our neighbour's claim upon us.'

Wherever in the world I am,
In whatsoever estate,
I have a fellowship with hearts
To keep and cultivate.

The Bible picture of heaven is of a city thronged with folk. No one who dislikes neighbours can expect to be happy in heaven.

One element that goes into the right attitude of loving appreciation of one's fellows is toleration, a readiness to admit and accept the way another differs from oneself. Meredith says that one should be ready to see dear ones looking rather ridiculous and yet love them none the less. The theme of a recent striking novel is an unhappy marriage. The pair had fancied themselves in love and got married and then found each other a continual irritation. The trouble was—and in this rather high-brow novel it took a psycho-analyst to find it out—that the man was always wanting to change his wife's habits and character. She was in many ways, as he quite recognized, extremely charming. But he was a particularly neat-fingered and tidy man, while she was clumsy and careless. Her awkwardness got on his nerves so that he forgot his admiration for her love of music and her warm-hearted ways. And on her side the steadiness and deftness that had made her feel he would be so reliable a husband began to bore her. To be a good neighbour, in marriage or in any other relation, requires tolerance, taking people as they are, appreciating the qualities they possess, having a willingness to share their outlook and learn from them rather than a desire to change them into some other pattern. They have a claim on sympathy and comradeship as far as you can give it, and if they need helping out of holes, love means that you are glad to do so.

And another element is pity and the desire to help. The greatest and the least share the weakness and frailty of humanity. All need support, the encouragement of loyalty or generous praise,

services from others, trifling perhaps, even menial, yet giving ease, comfort, strength. When ready, sympathetic helpfulness passes or rises into some large deep understanding of the need of some struggling or sorrowful or sinful neighbour it becomes compassion like that of Jesus, who saw the multitudes as sheep without a shepherd, and taught them. One urged by such love shares not only the life of his neighbour but also the life of God, who also loves him. 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' is the law of heaven.

SUNDAY NEXT BEFORE ADVENT.

The Sin of the Second Best.

BY THE REVEREND T. TUDOR RHYS, B.A., B.D.,
HINCKLEY.

'Sanballat and Geshem sent unto me, saying, Come, let us meet together in some one of the villages in the plain of Ono. But they thought to do me mischief.'—Neh 6⁴.

The worst of it was that that was a good idea ! It was a sensible plan. Indeed, if the actual building operation had turned out to be a physical impossibility, it was the very thing that Nehemiah himself would have tried next. It was the second best thing to do : namely, instead of going on with the work on the walls, to go down for a talk on the plains. It was the same work, to be sure, but on a different level. But Nehemiah saw the drift of it. It was an attempt to wean him away from his high ideals by suggesting ideals a little bit lower. 'Why should the work cease, whilst I leave it,' he answered, 'and come down to you ?'

Whenever you set out to do your best for God and man, depend upon it that you are looking for trouble ! No sooner had Nehemiah begun his work upon the walls than there appeared the three fine gentlemen, Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem. They constantly appear and reappear throughout history. They tried first the method of ridicule : 'If a fox stepped up,' they sneered, 'he would knock down that stone wall !' But Nehemiah was a good man, he was not going to be laughed out of doing his best for God. The next method they tried was the method of intimidation. They got together a band of roughs and tried to stop him by force. But Nehemiah was a good man, he was not going to be frightened out of doing his best for God. Their third was the psychological method. They studied their man and arrived at a plan of attack along the lines of their victim's temperament. 'Nehemiah,' they said to themselves, 'is a good man, therefore he can only be tempted by something that looks like a good thing. He is a man who will have nothing but the best, therefore he can only be tempted by a good second best.' Armed with this knowledge they went back to where Nehemiah was at work and said to him : 'Busy building ? Splendid ! You are doing a great work. But we suggest that your methods are wrong !' They knew that Nehemiah's passion was doing God's work. They therefore knew that it was useless to tempt him with any-

thing outrageously wrong. God's people are not tempted by irreligion, but they are tempted by an easier religion. Good people are not tempted to do anything obviously bad, but they are tempted to try a less effective method of doing good. So they made their suggestion : 'Come, let us meet together in one of the villages in the plain of Ono !'

And that, I said just now, was a good idea. But the worst of it is that the enemy of the best is not the worst, but the second best. What threatens the good is not the bad, but the good enough. But Nehemiah saw the plausibility of it and the drift of it and the fatal consequences of it : 'Why should the work cease, whilst I leave it, and come down to you ?'

Always in history the downward trend of men and nations has begun in the forsaking of what was best for some easier, more selfish, more expedient second best. We see now that the League of Nations of 1920 may not have been the absolute best upon which to build the walls of a new and unified world whose only law is love and universal brotherhood. But it was the 'one good thing' that had come out of the war of 1914-18. It was the best thing possible at that time and in those circumstances. Looking back we see now what happened. To some the League seemed to be too fanciful and visionary, and it met with ridicule. Then it came to be felt that it did not serve the interests of this or that sovereign State and compromises were made. The result was that the 'best' was replaced by a second best, and that, in turn, by a third best, and the names of these not-so-good alternatives are familiar—collective security, sanctions, and so on down the scale. That, in brief, was the sad story of decline during the years following the first world war until, at last, the whole world slipped down the slope into the 'unavoidable' second world war !

Is that to happen again ? Let us beware. When a man lets go his hold of the best and accepts the second best let him heed his steps lest he go the primrose way to the everlasting bonfire. And that is true of nations and of the world. The warning of history is this : If ever, in your working, thinking, or praying you discover something of which you can say : 'This is the best thing of its kind I have ever known,' then cling to it, live by it, and, if possible, seek a higher and a better still : but never let it go, and never forsake it for a lower thing. And in this matter of war or peace, that warning has never been more urgent than it is now. The subtlest and most insidious of sins is the sin of the second best, for the second best is always the first of a series of descending alternatives, each one not so good as the one before.

The temptation of the second best is very real. It is so in art and literature. A man of genius has first of all to create the taste by which he is to be judged and understood. That is why the work of a pioneer is sometimes difficult to understand, and people are not going to pay for what they cannot appreciate. That is why men like Mozart, Millet, and Milton have died in poverty. They have been

unwilling to lower their ideals to serve any second best. If Milton had been living to-day he could have written lurid scenarios for the films and become a millionaire. What, in fact, did he do?

I thence

Invoke thy aid to my adventurous song,
That with no middle flight intends to soar
Above the Aonian mount, while it pursues
Things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme.

What was the result? Milton got only £10 for *Paradise Lost*, and his widow got only £8 for the entire rights. Milton was the poorer by losing the world; but the world was the richer by one Immortal.

And it is so in daily life. Many of God's people are feeling driven and disillusioned. Maybe you, too, have been on the point of giving up giving your best. God, you say, expects too much. He demands the impossible. The best is always beyond us. Maybe it is! From the poor woman Christ welcomed the last farthing, all she had. From the ordinary man Christ demanded the one talent, the best he could do. And we, too, if we are risen with Christ, are bidden to ascend with Him, seeking ever 'the things which are above.' To find out what you cannot do, and then to try to do it: that is the temper of all those who are helping the eternal God to make His energies available for this stricken world.

What was it that helped Nehemiah to keep his grip upon the best?

(1) It was its *uplifting power*—'I am doing a great work.' Beyond his little bit of broken wall he could catch a vision of the finished work. And we, to-day? We see not yet all things—but we see Jesus crowned.

(2) And its *compelling power*—'I cannot come down.' Come down? Of course he could have come down! A few steps and he would have been down. Yet he said: 'I cannot come down!' There are some things that are physically easy but morally impossible! The lifting of an eyebrow, a motion of the hand, a nodding of the head, the writing of that letter of resignation—and the thing is done! But you cannot. Why not? It is because you are not your own master. You are under the compulsion of the best. After all, the highest freedom is to be held captive by the best. It is to be in the grip of the love that will not let you go.

What is the secret of it all? George Tyrrell was a good man and he suffered much because of his loyalty to the truth as he saw it. This is what he wrote at the end of one of his letters: 'What a relief if one could conscientiously wash one's hands of the whole concern! But then, there is that Strange Man upon the Cross who drives me back again and again.' That is the secret. It is He who drives us back to the walls and keeps us true to the best. And He only asks us to follow where He has led. He went up to the Cross. He was breathing low. Life was ebbing fast. 'And they that passed by reviled Him, wagging their heads. And saying, Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself.

If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross.' Who among us could have blamed Him if He had surrendered the best and taken the easier way? If He had failed, His failure would have knocked the bottom out of our moral universe. But He did not fail. He endured the Cross, broke it and carried it away in triumph. And the power of that redeeming act is full on to-day. Then back to the walls and on with the work, remembering that we are doing a work whose back has already been broken on the Cross. We are fighting a battle whose issue has already been fought out and won. In any hour of defeat or despair let us say, you and I: 'I am doing a great work, and I cannot come down.'

FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

God With Us.

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL CHARLES S.
DUTHIE, B.D., EDINBURGH.

'They shall call his name Emmanuel. . . . God with us.'—Mt 1²³.

A thought that often tortures the Christian mind to-day is the thought that God seems strangely absent from the world He Himself has made. It is hard at any time to justify the ways of God to men. But what if these ways are so hidden that we can scarcely find them, let alone justify them? If we are honest, we Christians dare not make the claim that a Christian interpretation of the world leaves no important questions unanswered. What we can claim is that it leaves *fewer* unanswered than any rival interpretation. At the centre there is light; but as we move away from the centre we strike against shadow and mystery before which the only possible attitudes are often those of wonder and waiting. To-day, when civilization is still shuddering from the impact of total war, when whole peoples have been decimated and millions of families uprooted from ancestral soil, when heavy blows have been dealt to decency and morality, when political philosophies stand intransigently over against each other in competition for human loyalty, when prophets forecast the world-state one day and the apocalyptic end of our civilization the next, it is not easy to see where the divine purpose and concern for man impinge upon the life of the nations. The old, robust, contagious faith that the world is God's, that He is mightily at work in it and is conducting it to some splendid consummation which will justify its long travail—that faith is hard put to it to preserve a foothold in the shifting sand of cynicism and disillusionment.

How can Christian folk to-day face and master the numbing fear that God may somehow be remote and aloof from His world and perhaps even no longer its governor? How can we ourselves be sure and then help to persuade others that the world-process in which we are involved is one of redemption and not of judgment and destruction? The message of Advent furnishes us with the answer. For Advent directs our gaze to the only light that shines upon our bewildering

darkness. That light streams from a stable in Bethlehem in which the stupendous thing happened that is the marvel and the glory of our faith. In Jesus, God has visited and redeemed His people. He has not only drawn near to His world, He has entered it. The pervading Spirit of God has become the invading and then the indwelling Spirit. *With Jesus, God Himself has come to the world and come to stay.* This was the conclusion to which the first disciples were irresistibly led. The Christ they knew was too big and had done too much for them to be less than divine. Confronted in Him with the veritable presence of God they saw Bethlehem as the supreme act of divine condescension, Calvary as the furthest reach of divine love, Easter as the triumph of divine power over evil, and Pentecost as the sure pledge of the divine continuance with the believing community in the world. The story of Jesus is the same story throughout. It is the history of God stooping to enter and share the life of His children. Jesus is Emmanuel, 'God with us.'

Here, then, is the inspiring Christian conviction, made possible by Advent, that meets and answers the age-old cry of the heart of man for a God who is his companion, sharing his ecstasy, his tragedy, his achievement, his temptation, the whole range of his earthly life. Consider its relevance to the evil and suffering which our present century has brought upon itself. If God is not somehow present in the hell men make for themselves and others, constantly seeking to turn them to repentance and renewal, we cannot be said to have a gospel big enough to outreach the limit and the depth of man's sinning. Theologians may conjecture a God incapable of disturbing His infinite beatitude by allowing a contact with our anguish; but the Christian man who has observed the fellow-suffering and the sacrifice to which human nature can rise rightly surmises that God must be behind this, and that the Divine Lover is more costingly involved in the plight of His children than the most sensitive and brotherly and loving of these same children can ever be in the plight of each other. When he looks at Jesus and recalls the great, divine act of self-emptying that brought Him from eternity into time, he is filled with the comforting knowledge that God lays Himself alongside His children and takes their sorrows upon His heart. A von Hügel may say that God's sympathy can never become God's suffering, that 'He has allowed real, direct suffering to come as close to Him, in the humanity of Christ, as it can come'; but a Studdert Kennedy, agonizing to discover how God touches a race broken by the madness of modern war and starting always from what Jesus was to men, arrives at a very different goal.

Father, if He, the Christ, were Thy Revealer,
Truly the First Begotten of the Lord,
Then must Thou be a Sufferer and a Healer,
Pierced to the heart by the sorrow of the sword.

Because Jesus is Emmanuel we can meet life's most shattering experiences with the confidence

that God is passing through them with us and that nothing can separate us from His love in Christ. And because He is present we can be supervisors over everything that threatens to break our spirits and rob us of inward peace.

Or consider, again, the impetus this gives to hopeful Christian action and the power it supplies for the renewal of the Church. We are in some danger to-day of sitting down disconsolate before the greatness of our tasks. We have gained new and fruitful insights into the claim the Christian gospel makes upon the total sphere of our living; but the very extent of the Christian commitment in the modern world may paralyse us. Religion of a vital kind has to be carried to a community still clinging to the forms of Christian morality but possessing no first-hand knowledge of the beliefs that sustain it. The widening gaps between nations have somehow to be closed. The colour bar has to be outlawed. Christian principles have to be related to the shape of society. The youth of the land has to be challenged to adventurous discipleship as the hope of the Church of to-morrow. The Good News has to be borne to the whole world. How can our pitiful resources stand up to the increasing strain of demand piled upon demand? The answer is that they cannot. To face the demand of God without the succour of God, the challenge of God without the promises of God, is the swiftest way to despair. The succour and the promise lie in the undergirding and over-arching presence of God. Analysing the factors which gave Christianity its first triumph in history Dr. T. R. Glover wrote: 'It is very well to emphasize the great gain to the Christians of a moral ideal without compromise, of the standards of God, of identification with the world's sin and sorrow, of responsibility, initiative, and so forth; but where was the dynamic?' What is the answer to that question? 'The dynamic,' Dr. Glover went on, 'lay in the sense of the presence of Christ with the believer.' Here lies the key to every future victory. To look to Christ as our Emmanuel is first to know that God is *on our side*, as our supporter. More than that, it is to be sure that He is *by our side*, as our companion. And, going deeper still, it is to learn through obedience and communion that He is *within us* as a gracious and abiding presence. If God is with us, then mind and heart are freed from unworthy fears to give themselves without haste and without rest to the exacting tasks of our generation. If God is with us, then what we are doing in His Church is no trifling operation that may fail because the odds against us are too great. It is part of that cosmic work of reconciliation which God originates and in which we are now His collaborators. If God is with us, we can be content to play our part in our day without seeking evidence for the ultimate victory of goodness, and leave our successors to begin where we have ended, with a quiet mind.

Or, finally, think of the light this sheds upon our primary task of Christian evangelism. Since God is assuredly with us in every endeavour to recover His lost children, we must seek to use only His method of loving persuasion. And, if we are to

achieve our end, must we not proceed upon the assumption that God is already in some sense present with those to whom we bear the message of His restoring love? 'God is present and active,' runs a passage in *The Era of Atomic Power*, 'exerting a continuous influence and pressure on men's lives, however little they may be aware of it.' John Pulsford, a Scottish mystic of the nineteenth century, could dare to say of missionaries: 'They are not sent to reveal to men a Redeemer who is afar off but a Redeemer who is with them and in them. Let the missionary everywhere tell the heathen that there is "One among them whom they know not" and that he is come to make Him known to them, even the holy, friendly, helping presence which they have all felt moving and working in their dark souls.' Only such a vision can enable us to approach the human soul with a due sense of wonder; and without a sense of wonder the work of evangelism must always be ill done. The perception that in every enterprise of reconciliation God Himself has gone before us to prepare the way is in itself the best preparation for the sharing of the friendship in which Christ Himself can be shown to men; for it is part of the acknowledgment that it is not we but God who makes men new. We have the treasure of Christ's presence in the fragile containers of our own faith that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of us.

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Soul's Surmise.

'I am the way, the truth, and the life.'—Jn 14⁶.

The Christian message and call to the modern man is a simple one, at least in its general statement and in the kind of response it invites. It affirms that there is an ultimate Holy Purpose above and beyond the world and human life yet at work within the world and human life, and that He has made Himself known to us in a way that is unique, final, completely adequate, and wholly indispensable in the person of Jesus Christ. Let a man build his life on the basis of that affirmation, build it, too, not as an isolated and private experiment but in the light of the long experience of those who have made the same venture all down the ages and in fellowship with those who are prepared to make it now, and it will stand, because, to use Jesus' own image, 'it is founded upon a rock.'

1. But how can we come to share the Christian conviction about Christ so that, no matter what mysteries may remain, or how far we may range in perplexed reflection on the underlying theoretical problems, we are constrained to say with increasing conviction as the years pass that He is, after all, the Way, the Truth and the Life? The answer we give is this: the Christian affirmation about Christ can only become a living and massive conviction within the soul in the course of the life of Christian discipleship itself.

It will be said, how is it possible, for a man to centre his whole life in Christ at some cost to him-

self if he is not first convinced that what the Christian faith says of Him is true?

The answer is that there are two kinds of conviction. There is what Santayana calls 'the soul's invincible surmise,' and there is what is no longer surmise but is a solid and tested certainty sustaining the whole life of the soul. The first, if a man can find the courage to commit himself to it and live by it, leads on to the second. Many examples might be given of this, for indeed in all the higher reaches of our experience our minds seem to work in this way.

Personal relationships of trust and love begin, and can only begin, in that way. To make a man a friend it is necessary to treat him as a friend; yet you can only treat him as a friend if you sense in advance of any experimental justification that he is capable of friendship and will answer trust with trustworthiness. Similarly, the power to appreciate the best things in art and music and literature can only be acquired by making the effort to keep company with them, even though at first, despite some deep surmise that they are there to be appreciated, they bore us. As Mr. C. E. M. Joad has put it:

'Good taste is born of faith that the kingdom of beauty can neither be purchased with dollars nor taken by storm, but must be approached by a process of trial and error, a willingness to learn, and the humility which is prepared to accept in faith on the judgment of others what it cannot yet dare to reject on its own.'

And such faith, be it noted, is not taking a gambler's chance; there is more conviction in it than that; the whole thing grips us with something of the compulsiveness of the real. Yet, paradoxically, it is in another sense not yet real—to us; it awaits our realization. And the realization depends on action.

So it is, only in a much deeper and more critical way, with the Christian experience of, and conviction about, Christ. There must be something of the adventure of faith, yet none of us could make—perhaps none of us ought to make—such an adventure if it were just a blind and despairing leap into the dark. In one way or another, be it in never so small a degree, Christ must evoke in us the surmise, going beyond anything that past experience or the theoretical reason could justify, that He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, that amidst a very chaotic and perplexing world mirrored in the chaos and complexity of our own souls, He is God's word of demand and succour to us.

How then does this surmise arise in the soul? In countless ways, doubtless, corresponding to the infinite differentiation and particularity of individual lives. Nevertheless one quite general, if obvious, thing can be said, namely, that a man must be willing to look at the fact of Christ with such sincerity as he can muster. And such looking at the fact of Christ should take note of, in one way or another, at least these three things.

2. First, there is the picture of Jesus Christ which is given in the Gospel stories and in the New Testament generally. And there is one thing

in the New Testament picture of Christ which, above all things else, must be looked at, and looked at again and again. It is Calvary. Whatever else the death of Christ may mean it certainly confronts the serious mind with that sort of final dilemma which is one of God's ways of challenging the soul of man and striking through all its evasions to a deeper insight and response. Calvary must mean one of two things: either that such a style of life, dedicated to the proposition that God is Love and that in Love is the secret of existence, is so utterly wide of the truth that it cannot stand up to the actual forces of the world, and must in the end be broken and annihilated by them, or, on the other hand, that it is so utterly in harmony with the truth that it can fully afford to accept even such an apparent annihilation, knowing that the victory is in the end with it, knowing, indeed, that the defeat will itself play a part in victory. The New Testament triumphantly accepts and affirms the second half of the dilemma, and we can only ask those who are prepared to look at the Cross of Christ, and to confront the dilemma for themselves, whether an invincible surmise does not stir in their hearts that the New Testament is right. Perhaps, indeed, the surmise will at first be hardly more than a profound feeling that one would rather be utterly defeated and annihilated with Christ than succeed with the crooked and callous men who defeated and annihilated Him; yet what is that but the dim vision that the Cross is not really defeat and annihilation at all but essential victory? For no one can really take his stand by what in the nature of things is doomed to utter defeat.

Second, there is not only the picture of Christ in the Gospels and in the New Testament, but also the picture of Him, in some ways much nearer and more challenging, in the person of those whose mind and spirit have been fashioned by Jesus Christ. In these Christ comes out of the past and becomes part of our contemporary world. Some may say that they have not been fortunate enough to meet such people. Well, it is possible to meet them in indirect ways. It is possible to read the lives of people like Kagawa and Schweitzer and Grenfell. They are *part of the fact of Christ*. They would not be what they are, or where they are, but for the impact of Christ on them reaching them in part, be it noted, through the Church. And yet it is not really necessary to go to such distinguished and world-renowned figures. It is possible to see, if we want to see it, a Christ-style of life, rising out of the life of discipleship, in much more humble people. When we see it something within at once leaps to the thought, surmises, that that sort of thing is the only true strength and dignity and maturity of the human spirit, everything else by contrast being relatively mean and animal and childish.

Or again, thirdly, we might ask this question: Does not some surmise that the divine secret of life is in the Christ-style of life arise in our mind

when we look out across the hideous confusion and chaos, all the tangle and rupture of personal relationships, of the modern world, not to speak of the tangle and rupture of personal relationships in more domestic situations known to many of us? It would be merely silly and sentimental to say that if we were all to begin discipleship to Jesus every problem would be instantly solved. None the less it remains a plain and undeniable fact that if we take any major evil of the present world we do not have to go far back in the causes that have led up to it to find this point or that point where most manifestly there was a complete flouting of the kind of thing for which Christ stood.

This then is the first question: Is there anything at all in us which in the least degree responds to the proposition that Jesus Christ is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, even if it be only by way of an inescapable surmise? If there is, this further question arises: What are we going to do about it? Here three alternatives lie before us.

3. We may ignore this surmise of our spirit and do nothing in the way of actively setting the course of our life in accordance with it. This is in effect a declaration not only that Christ's way of looking at things was false, but also, what is in a way much more serious in its implications and consequences, that our own best and highest sense of value and truth is false also. To have even a dim sense of what is good and what is evil, and not to respond to it is to run fast in the direction either of an ultimate scepticism or an ultimate villainy, or both.

Or we may in effect decide that we will allow the values for which Christ stood to have *some* dominance over our life as a kind of purifying agent or sweetener, but no more. This is better than nothing, but it has at the heart of it a fundamental inconsistency and weakness. The inconsistency is this, that when you look into the life and personality of Christ you find that He insists again and again that the secret of life is not vague and occasional sentiment about love and brotherhood, but an absolute surrender to the will of God; there are no half measures. The weakness is that when matters reach a crisis that sort of attitude is already half defeated.

Or, finally, we may choose to follow the lead of countless men and women all down the ages, and launch out with seriousness of purpose on the path indicated by this surmise, this deep sense, that Christ is right.

No one will suppose that such a way of life will be easy going. Yet it will have its satisfaction and rewards, and in every hardness endured there will be hidden a new revelation of the goodness of God, a new confirmation of that first answering surmise of the soul that Christ is what He claimed to be: the Way, the Truth, and the Life for mankind.¹

¹ H. H. Farmer, *The Healing Cross*, 10.

Recent Foreign Theology.

THE work which is known best to English readers as *The Zadokite Work*—since it bears that title in Charles's *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*—has recently been re-examined by J. Schousboe,¹ who gives it a completely new interpretation. Starting from a suggestion of F. F. Hvidberg's, he propounds the view that it dates from shortly after A.D. 70, and that it emanated from the followers of John the Baptist, and contains a good deal of polemic against the Christians, who were regarded as a renegade offshoot from the Johannine community. Both dating and interpretation are original, and neither is free from difficulty. The community, which had its headquarters in Damascus, is said to have come into existence 390 years after Nebuchadnezzar's conquest of Jerusalem. Schousboe has no difficulty in showing that other ancient sources had little accurate knowledge of the chronology of this period, and he places the birth of the community c. 24 B.C. For this date there is no positive evidence in the chronological data of the texts, and it is not established that John the Baptist became the leader in an already existing sect. Schousboe offers a running commentary on the surviving fragments of the text in the light of his hypothesis, and claims that they form an important historical source for the period. If the date were more than a theory, this might be agreed, but an interpretation which depends on the theory for its validity can hardly offer support to the theory.

Schousboe finds the 'Teacher of Righteousness,' or the 'Unique Teacher' to be John the Baptist, who is also identified with 'the Messiah from Aaron and Israel,' and the dating of the work shortly after the Destruction of the Temple rests on the expectation that the Messianic Age was to begin forty years after the days of the Teacher. The 'Man of Insolence' is then found to be Jesus, and since there are references to persecution, and even to bloodshed, Schousboe believes that there must have been some bitter strife between the followers of John the Baptist and the Christians. This seems to the reviewer a most precarious hypothesis, which is sufficient to throw doubt on the whole theory. Some concrete evidence that the early Christians were persecutors and murderers should be provided before such a conclusion is deduced from a theory.

Yet, having said this, the reviewer would commend this work to the careful study of readers. Such wide divergence of dating and interpretation has marked the study of these fragments, and we are still so much in the dark about them, that no view is barred because it is new. And apart from his theory of the date and character of this work, his study assembles much ancient material that is

of high value. In particular it offers a most valuable review of all that is stated about the Dositheans in ancient writers, since the author identifies the sect from which the work emanated with the Dositheans.

Two new Introductions to the Old Testament have recently been published on the Continent, both quite different from one another and both quite different from the usual works which bear this title. The first is published in Switzerland, and its main title, *The Covenant of God*,² indicates its dominantly religious interest. The second is published in Sweden, and while in its title there is nothing that clearly indicates it, it too shows a considerable interest in the religious development of Israel.³

The author of the Swiss work is Bruno Balscheit, whose book is of the popular and non-technical kind. It takes for granted the usual critical approach to the Old Testament, and most of the findings of critical scholarship, but does not discuss the processes by which these results are obtained. Instead it is more concerned to ask for what purpose the editors of the books in the form in which we now have them compiled them from the sources they employed. The books of the Old Testament are briefly examined in turn, set in the historical circumstances out of which they arose, and then studied as religious documents for their message to their first readers and their contribution to the totality of the message of the Old Testament.

Throughout the author bases himself upon sound scholarship, and his critical positions are in the main those generally adopted. On disputed questions he indicates his own views without mentioning others, or discussing the grounds on which they rest. He regards Rameses II as the Pharaoh of the Oppression, retains the traditional view that Ezra preceded Nehemiah, adheres to the Wedding Song theory of the Song of Songs that was current at the beginning of this century, accepts the view that in Israel there was a New Year's feast associated with the enthronement of Yahweh, but presents some original views on the second half of the Book of Isaiah. He holds that Is 40-55 and 66 are from one hand, and that other separate songs became attached to the collection. He finds five Servant Songs, Is 61¹⁻³ being attached to the usual four. He thinks the Servant may have been a figure of the past, or Jehoiachin, or even the prophet himself, up to a point, but holds that the faith of the Songs found its goal in Christ. The Book of Daniel he regards as a unity, dating

² *Der Gottesbund: Einführung in das Alte Testament* (1943). Zwingli-Verlag; Zürich.

³ *Gamla Testamentet: en traditionshistorisk Inledning*, i. (1945). Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bok-förlag; Stockholm.

¹ *La secte juive de l'Alliance Nouvelle au pays de Damas et le Christianisme naissant* (1942). Munksgaard; Copenhagen.

from the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, and to the same age he ascribes Deutero-Zechariah. Habakkuk he places in the Greek period.

The book is typical of much present-day work in seeking to advance beyond the study of merely critical questions to the superstructure that is to stand on these foundations, but Balscheit wishes his superstructure to stand firmly on these foundations. He is never tempted to suggest that the religious study of the Old Testament can dispense with the critical study.

The other work will be less accessible to British readers because it is written in Swedish. It is by Ivan Engnell, who published a previous work in English,¹ and it is to be hoped that an English edition of the present work will also appear. So far only the first volume has been published. Its scope may be briefly indicated as follows: a few pages on the history of the Canon; the languages and textual criticism of the Old Testament; the poetic and prose literary forms; a review of the history of Old Testament religion; and a study of Pentateuchal criticism. There is thus no general introduction to all the books of the Old Testament yet, though in the last section much more than the Pentateuch is touched on.

In this section Engnell first sets forth briefly the classical Wellhausen theory; then reviews literary criticism since Wellhausen; then studies modern reactions against the Wellhausen positions; and

¹ *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East* (1943); cf. *Journal of Theological Studies*, xli. [1945], 80 ff.

finally sets forth his own views. Here he incorporates some elements of Pedersen's views in a generally Wellhausenian scheme, though operating with traditions rather than with written sources, and these less clearly defined than the old sources. He regards Genesis to Numbers as a product of the priestly school, whose central complex is the cultic Passover text Ex 1-15; Deuteronomy to 2 Kings as a Deuteronomistic history; and 1 Chronicles to Nehemiah as the Chronicler's history. It will be seen, therefore, that the book represents a break with the *methods* of the school of literary criticism, as well as with some important aspects of its *results*.

Engnell attaches more importance to the work of Moses than some modern writers, and finds an ethical basis in the covenant which he established. In his review of the religious development he follows in the main the view commonly held, though in no sense passively following any one, stressing the syncretistic trends in Israel, and also the Yahwistic reaction against them. In harmony with his view expressed in his earlier work, he finds evidences of the divine kingship in Israel, and relates these to Messianic prophecy.

The work is well documented, and is addressed to a more learned circle than Balscheit's, being altogether more technical in its approach. Its sequel will be awaited with interest, and the whole seems likely to take its place as an original and important contribution to Old Testament scholarship.

H. H. ROWLEY.

Manchester.

Entre Nous.

Recent Poetry.

In the last six months a large number of volumes of poetry have appeared. All have merit, but only a few can be mentioned in these notes. Early in this period under review Dylan Thomas (born 1914, published his first volume of eighteen poems in 1934), produced *Deaths and Entrances* (Dent; 3s. 6d.). This small volume is mainly concerned with the problems of life and death, time and eternity. A large amount of symbolism, some of it Biblical, is to be found in these poems. The underlying note of faith is a faith in man taking his part in the continuity that is Life.

For some time many discerning people have been watching the progress of Norman Nicholson (born 1914, a reviewer of fiction and the contributor of excellent poetry to many literary periodicals. His lecture on *Morals and the Modern Novel* for the Student Christian Movement in 1939 was an interesting and discerning survey of modern tendencies). His sonnet for Good Friday, to be found in his *Anthology of Religious Verse*,

published by Pelican Books in 1942, led many to seek out his other poems. He has now published the play which was recently put on the London stage, *The Old Man of the Mountains* (Faber; 6s.). This is a very fine modern attempt to follow the writers of the morality and miracle plays in the Middle Ages. It is a re-telling of the story of Elijah, with the story set in the north of England.

Those who are interested in dialect verse will enjoy the volume *Under T' Hawthorn*, by Dorothy Una Ratcliffe (Muller; 8s. 6d.). Here is humour, simplicity, sorrow, irony delightfully presented. I liked 'Farmer Hodgson's Prayer.'

Two hundred year have we been here,
It's terrible hard to quit . . .
Tho' I'se nigh broken, give me, Lord,
Grit to work on wi'—Grit!

Edwin Muir has produced a volume of sober and mature reflection—*The Voyage and Other Poems* (Faber; 6s.). He had lived a nomad life in various countries, until just before the war. He has written some five or six volumes of poetry, some

fiction and some criticism. In this new volume we have deep searching after eternal things. Here is a man with much of the mystic in his make-up, questioning, and arriving at a simple creed:

Father Adam and Mother Eve
Make this pact with me:
Teach me, teach me to believe,
For to believe's to be.

Henry Reed, in *A Map of Verona* (Cape; 3s. 6d.), tells the story of man's struggles, his delusions, and his questionings—

You . . .
... tug at the streaming earth to find some spot
In which you may plant your torn chimerical
flowers
With a ruined wall to protect them.

Fifty young poets contributed to an anthology called *For Those Who Are Alive* (Fortune Press; 6s.). The volume sets out to show recent trends in the younger poets. It reaches a fairly high level of poetry, but the only trend it shows is the reaction of these younger poets to a war-torn world, few of the authors revealing any religious belief, the majority turning to Nature for healing. These are the same notes that were sounded a year or two ago in the anthology that John Pudney and Henry Treece edited, *Air Force Poems*.

In THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of May, 1946, I called attention to the poetry of Sidney Keyes, killed at twenty years of age. We now have the collected poems of Jonathan Wilson, *Poems* (Cape; 3s. 6d.). The author was fifteen years of age when war broke out. He entered the Army in 1942 and was killed after a few months of fighting. He shows sensitiveness and flashes of real power, but not, perhaps, the ability of Sidney Keyes. We can feel that war did not produce any outstanding poets, but it certainly silenced some who might have become great poets.

Frank Kendon in *Each Silver Fly* (Cambridge University Press; 1s. 6d.) has written a poem which won the Seatonian Prize. He takes as his text Pr 16¹¹, 'A just balance and scales are the Lord's.' There was much I liked in this poem:

I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills—
If not from them, from whence cometh help?
By the grey dirt and shrillness of the street
Or by way of the hills, the enormous silences,
Through the only gate upon God opening?
My help cometh from the Lord . . .

And again:

His range is calm and infinitely wide,
His doom dark and silently far-reaching;
Tender his star-rays, patient are his Alps;
Man's wars lie on the surface of that will,
Less than the ripple of an afterthought,
God's quiet unconcern.
How great that darkness! Nevertheless, I know
That my redeemer liveth, and shall stand—
But who I am that know, that I know not.

It may not come strictly under my title, but I should like to draw attention to the *George Macdonald Anthology*, edited by C. S. Lewis. In a tenderly worded introduction Mr. C. S. Lewis speaks of George Macdonald and of his own debt to him, 'In making this collection I am discharging a debt of justice. I have never concealed the fact that I regarded him as my master; indeed I fancy that I have never written a book in which I did not quote him.' But Mr. Lewis points out that this particular collection is 'concerned with Macdonald not as a writer but as a Christian teacher.'

I conclude with one quotation from this Anthology:

O Lord, I have been talking to the people;
Thought's wheels have round me whirled a fiery
zone,
And the recoil of my word's airy ripple
My heart unheeded has puffed up and blown.
Therefore I cast myself before thee prone:
Lay cool hands on my burning brain and press
From my weak heart the swelling emptiness.

R. W. THOMSON.

Burton-on-Trent.

Equality.

'In a society where equal opportunities for the enjoyment of all that life has to offer do not exist, how can we be said to love our comrades? While we enjoy what they cannot enjoy, friendly feelings toward them are a snare and a delusion. We are not taking Christianity seriously. It is a lie that the principle of equality is one of envy. The principle of equality is one of love; it is the burning desire to share with other people the delightful things which we come upon as we journey through life, the things to eat and things to drink, the scenes and songs, the useful implements and attractive objects; that there should be a true *communitas* in work and pleasure; that in the words of an old Cornish carol "all mankind should come into the general dance."'¹

Rev. John Gray.

Two articles, 'The Theory of Love' and 'The Practice of Love,' contributed by the Rev. John Gray, B.D., Oxford, were unfortunately attributed to the Rev. John R. Gray, B.D., Ayr, in the Index printed in the September issue.

¹ J. Needham, *History is on our Side*.